arXiv:1404.7695v1 [cs.LO] 30 Apr 2014

First-Order Formative Rules

Carsten Fuhs and Cynthia Kop

This technical report is an extended version of the paper [5], to be published at RTA-TLCA 2014. It includes an appendix for three purposes:

- giving complete proofs of the results which, for space reasons, are only sketched in the paper;
- providing extensions to the results in the paper, which are used to obtain a more convenient implementation;
- discussing implementation details.

First-Order Formative Rules*

Carsten Fuhs[1] and Cynthia Kop[2]

[1] University College London, Dept. of Computer Science, London WC1E 6BT, UK
[2] University of Innsbruck, Institute of Computer Science, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria

Abstract This paper discusses the method of *formative rules* for first-order term rewriting, which was previously defined for a higher-order setting. Dual to the well-known *usable rules*, formative rules allow dropping some of the term constraints that need to be solved during a termination proof. Compared to the higher-order definition, the first-order setting allows for significant improvements of the technique.

1 Introduction

In [12,13] C. Kop and F. van Raamsdonk introduce the notion of *formative rules*. The technique is similar to the method of *usable rules* [1,9,10], which is commonly used in termination proofs, but has different strengths and weaknesses.

Since, by [15], the more common *first-order* style of term rewriting, both with and without types, can be seen as a subclass of the formalism of [13], this result immediately applies to first-order rewriting. In an untyped setting, we will, however, lose some of its strength, as sorts play a relevant role in formative rules.

On the other hand, by omitting the complicating aspects of higher-order term rewriting (such as λ-abstraction and "collapsing" rules $l \to x \cdot y$) we also gain possibilities not present in the original setting; both things which *have not* been done, as the higher-order dependency pair framework [11] is still rather limited, and things which *cannot* be done, at least with current theory. Therefore, in this paper, we will redefine the method for (many-sorted) first-order term rewriting.

New compared to [13], we will integrate formative rules into the dependency pair framework [7], which is the basis of most contemporary termination provers for first-order term rewriting. Within this framework, formative rules are used either as a stand-alone processor or with reduction pairs, and can be coupled with usable rules and argument filterings. We also formulate a semantic characterisation of formative rules, to enable future generalisations of the definition. Aside from this, we present a (new) way to weaken the detrimental effect of collapsing rules.

This paper is organised as follows. After the preliminaries in Section 2, a first definition of formative rules is given and then generalised in Section 3. Section 4 shows various ways to use formative rules in the dependency pair framework. Section 5 gives an alternative way to deal with collapsing rules. In Section 6 we consider innermost termination, Section 7 describes implementation and experiments, and in Section 8 we point out possible future work and conclude. All proofs and an improved formative rules approximation are provided in the appendix.

* Support by EPSRC & the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) international project I963.

2 Preliminaries

We consider *many-sorted term rewriting*: term rewriting with *sorts*, basic types. While sorts are not usually considered in studies of first-order term rewrite systems (TRSs) and for instance the Termination Problems Data Base[3] does not include them (for first-order TRSs),[4] they are a natural addition; in typical applications there is little need to allow untypable terms like `3+apple`. Even when no sorts are present, a standard TRS can be seen as a many-sorted TRS with only one sort.[5]

Many-sorted TRSs We assume given a non-empty set $\mathcal{S}$ of *sorts*; these are typically things like `Nat` or `Bool`, or (for representing unsorted systems) $\mathcal{S}$ might be the set with a single sort $\{\mathtt{o}\}$. A *sort declaration* is a sequence $[\kappa_1 \times \ldots \times \kappa_n] \Rightarrow \iota$ where ι and all κ_i are sorts. A sort declaration $[] \Rightarrow \iota$ is just denoted ι.

A *many-sorted signature* is a set Σ of function symbols f, each equipped with a sort declaration σ, notation $f : \sigma \in \Sigma$. Fixing a many-sorted signature Σ and an infinite set $\mathcal{V}$ of sorted variables, the set of *terms* consists of those expressions s over Σ and $\mathcal{V}$ for which we can derive $s : \iota$ for some sort ι, using the clauses:

$$x : \iota \text{ if } x : \iota \in \mathcal{V}$$
$$f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) : \iota \text{ if } f : [\kappa_1 \times \ldots \times \kappa_n] \Rightarrow \iota \in \Sigma \text{ and } s_1 : \kappa_1,\ \ldots,\ s_n : \kappa_n$$

We often denote $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ as just $f(\boldsymbol{s})$. Clearly, every term has a unique sort. Let $Var(s)$ be the set of all variables occurring in a term s. A term s is *linear* if every variable in $Var(s)$ occurs only once in s. A term t is a *subterm* of another term s, notation $s \trianglerighteq t$, if either $s = t$ or $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and some $s_i \trianglerighteq t$. A *substitution* γ is a mapping from variables to terms of the same sort; the application $s\gamma$ of a substitution γ on a term s is s with each $x \in \mathsf{domain}(\gamma)$ replaced by $\gamma(x)$.

A *rule* is a pair $\ell \to r$ of terms with the same sort such that ℓ is not a variable.[6] A rule is *left-linear* if ℓ is linear, and *collapsing* if r is a variable. Given a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, the *reduction relation* $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$ is given by: $\ell\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}} r\gamma$ if $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ and γ a substitution; $f(\ldots, s_i, \ldots) \to_{\mathcal{R}} f(\ldots, s_i', \ldots)$ if $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} s_i'$. A term s is in *normal form* if there is no t such that $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$.

The relation $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ is the transitive-reflexive closure of $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$. If there is a rule $f(\boldsymbol{l}) \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ we say that f is a *defined symbol*; otherwise f is a *constructor*.

A *many-sorted term rewrite system (MTRS)* is a pair $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ with signature Σ and a set $\mathcal{R}$ of rules $\ell \to r$ with $Var(r) \subseteq Var(\ell)$. A term s is *terminating* if there is no infinite reduction $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_1 \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_2 \ldots$ An MTRS is terminating if all terms are.

Example 1. An example of a many-sorted TRS $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ with more than one sort is the following system, which uses lists, natural numbers and a `RESULT` sort:

[3] More information on the *TPDB*: `http://termination-portal.org/wiki/TPDB`

[4] This may also be due to the fact that currently most termination tools for first-order rewriting only make very limited use of the additional information carried by types.

[5] However, the method of this paper is stronger given more sorts. We may be able to (temporarily) infer richer sorts, however. We will say more about this in Section 6.

[6] Often also $Var(r) \subseteq Var(\ell)$ is required. However, we use *filtered* rules $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \to \overline{\pi}(r)$ later, where the restriction is inconvenient. As a rule is non-terminating if $Var(r) \not\subseteq Var(\ell)$, as usual we forbid such rules in the input $\mathcal{R}$ and in dependency pair problems.

$$\begin{array}{lll} \mathtt{0} : \mathtt{NAT} & \mathtt{Cons} : [\mathtt{NAT} \times \mathtt{LIST}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{LIST} & \mathtt{Run} : [\mathtt{LIST}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{RESULT} \\ \mathtt{S} : [\mathtt{NAT}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{NAT} & \mathtt{Ack} : [\mathtt{NAT} \times \mathtt{NAT}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{NAT} & \mathtt{Return} : [\mathtt{NAT}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{RESULT} \\ \mathtt{Nil} : \mathtt{LIST} & \mathtt{Big} : [\mathtt{NAT} \times \mathtt{LIST}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{NAT} & \mathtt{Rnd} : [\mathtt{NAT}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{NAT} \\ \mathtt{Err} : \mathtt{RESULT} & \mathtt{Upd} : [\mathtt{LIST}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{LIST} & \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} 1. & \mathtt{Rnd}(x) \to x & 6. \quad \mathtt{Big}(x, \mathtt{Nil}) \to x \\ 2. & \mathtt{Rnd}(\mathtt{S}(x)) \to \mathtt{Rnd}(x) & 7. \ \mathtt{Big}(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Big}(\mathtt{Ack}(x, y), \mathtt{Upd}(z)) \\ 3. & \mathtt{Upd}(\mathtt{Nil}) \to \mathtt{Nil} & 8. \quad \mathtt{Upd}(\mathtt{Cons}(x, y)) \to \mathtt{Cons}(\mathtt{Rnd}(x), \mathtt{Upd}(y)) \\ 4. & \mathtt{Run}(\mathtt{Nil}) \to \mathtt{Err} & 9. \quad \mathtt{Run}(\mathtt{Cons}(x, y)) \to \mathtt{Return}(\mathtt{Big}(x, y)) \\ 5. & \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{0}, y) \to \mathtt{S}(y) & 10. \quad \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x), y) \to \mathtt{Ack}(x, \mathtt{S}(y)) \\ & & 11. \quad \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x), \mathtt{S}(y)) \to \mathtt{Ack}(x, \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x), y)) \end{array}$$

$\mathtt{Run}(\mathit{lst})$ calculates a potentially very large number, depending on the elements of *lst* and some randomness. We have chosen this example because it will help to demonstrate the various aspects of formative rules, without being too long.

The Dependency Pair Framework As a basis to study termination, we will use the *dependency pair (DP) framework* [7], adapted to include sorts.

Given an MTRS $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, let $\Sigma^\sharp = \Sigma \cup \{f^\sharp : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \mathtt{dpsort} \mid f : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma \wedge f \text{ a defined symbol of } \mathcal{R}\}$, where $\mathtt{dpsort}$ is a fresh sort. The set $\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R})$ of *dependency pairs (DPs)* of $\mathcal{R}$ consists of all rules of the form $f^\sharp(l_1, \ldots, l_n) \to g^\sharp(r_1, \ldots, r_m)$ where $f(\boldsymbol{l}) \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ and $r \trianglerighteq g(\boldsymbol{r})$ with g a defined symbol.

Example 2. The dependency pairs of the system in Example 1 are:

$$\begin{array}{rl} \mathtt{Rnd}^\sharp(\mathtt{S}(x)) \to \mathtt{Rnd}^\sharp(x) & \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(x, y), \mathtt{Upd}(z)) \\ \mathtt{Upd}^\sharp(\mathtt{Cons}(x, y)) \to \mathtt{Rnd}^\sharp(x) & \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(x, y) \\ \mathtt{Upd}^\sharp(\mathtt{Cons}(x, y)) \to \mathtt{Upd}^\sharp(y) & \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Upd}^\sharp(z) \\ \mathtt{Run}^\sharp(\mathtt{Cons}(x, y)) \to \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, y) & \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(\mathtt{S}(x), \mathtt{S}(y)) \to \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x), y)) \\ \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(\mathtt{S}(x), y) \to \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{S}(y)) & \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(\mathtt{S}(x), \mathtt{S}(y)) \to \mathtt{Ack}^\sharp(\mathtt{S}(x), y) \end{array}$$

For sets $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ of rules, an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain is a sequence $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ where each $\ell_i \to r_i \in \mathcal{P}$ and γ_i is a substitution such that $r_i\gamma_i \to_\mathcal{R}^* \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$. This chain is *minimal* if each $r_i\gamma_i$ is terminating with respect to $\to_\mathcal{R}$.

Theorem 3. *(following [1,7,9,10]) An MTRS $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ is terminating if and only if there is no infinite minimal $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R})$-chain.*

A *DP problem* is a triple $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ with $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ sets of rules and $f \in \{\mathsf{m}, \mathsf{a}\}$ (denoting {minimal, arbitrary}).[7] A DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ is *finite* if there is no infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain, which is minimal if $f = \mathsf{m}$. A *DP processor* is a function which maps a DP problem to a set of DP problems. A processor *proc* is *sound* if, for all DP problems A: if all $B \in \mathit{proc}(A)$ are finite, then A is finite.

The goal of the DP framework is, starting with a set $D = \{(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m})\}$, to reduce D to $\emptyset$ using sound processors. Then we may conclude termination of the initial MTRS $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$.[8] Various common processors use a *reduction pair*, a pair

[7] Here we do not modify the signature $\Sigma^\sharp$ of a DP problem, so we leave $\Sigma^\sharp$ implicit.

[8] The full DP framework [7] can also be used for proofs of *non-termination*. Indeed, by [7, Lemma 2], all processors introduced in this paper (except Theorem 17 for innermost rewriting) are "complete" and may be applied in a non-termination proof.

$(\succsim, \succ)$ of a monotonic, stable (closed under substitutions) quasi-ordering $\succsim$ on terms and a well-founded, stable ordering $\succ$ compatible with $\succsim$ (i.e., $\succ \cdot \succsim \subseteq \succ$).

Theorem 4. *(following [1,7,9,10]) Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *if:*
  - $\ell \succ r$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\ell \succsim r$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *(with* $\mathcal{P}^{\succ} \subseteq \mathcal{P}$*);*
  - $\ell \succsim r$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$.
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise*

Here, we must orient all elements of $\mathcal{R}$ with $\succsim$. As there are many processors which remove elements from $\mathcal{P}$ and few which remove from $\mathcal{R}$, this may give many constraints. *Usable rules*, often combined with *argument filterings*, address this:

Definition 5. *(following [9,10]) Let Σ be a signature and $\mathcal{R}$ a set of rules. An* argument filtering *is a function that maps each $f : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa$ to a set $\{i_1, \ldots, i_k\} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$.*[9] *The* usable rules *of a term t with respect to an argument filtering π are defined as the smallest set $UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that:*

- *if $\mathcal{R}$ is not finitely branching (i.e. there are terms with infinitely many direct reducts), then $UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \mathcal{R}$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $UR(t_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ for all $i \in \pi(f)$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $\{\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R} \mid \ell = f(\ldots)\} \subseteq UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$;*
- *if $\ell \to r \in UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, then $UR(r, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$, we define $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} UR(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

Argument filterings π are used to disregard arguments of certain function symbols. Given π, let $f_\pi : [\iota_{i_1} \times \ldots \times \iota_{i_k}] \Rightarrow \kappa$ be a fresh function symbol for all f with $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ and $i_1 < \ldots < i_k$, and define $\overline{\pi}(x) = x$ for x a variable, and $\overline{\pi}(f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)) = f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))$ if $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$ and $i_1 < \ldots < i_k$. For a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, let $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}) = \{\overline{\pi}(l) \to \overline{\pi}(r) \mid l \to r \in \mathcal{R}\}$. The idea of usable rules is to only consider rules relevant to the pairs in $\mathcal{P}$ after applying $\overline{\pi}$.

Combining usable rules, argument filterings and reduction pairs, we obtain:

Theorem 6. *([9,10]) Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m})\}$ *if $f = \mathsf{m}$ and:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$*;*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$*,*
    where $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon = \{\mathsf{c}_\iota(x, y) \to x, \mathsf{c}_\iota(x, y) \to y \mid$ *all sorts* $\iota\}$.
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise*

We define $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$ as $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi_{\mathcal{T}})$, where $\pi_{\mathcal{T}}$ is the *trivial filtering*: $\pi_{\mathcal{T}}(f) = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ for $f : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma$. Then Theorem 6 is exactly the standard reduction pair processor, but with constraints on $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ instead of $\mathcal{R}$. We could also use a processor which maps $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m})$ to $\{(\mathcal{P}, UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon, \mathsf{a})\}$, but as this loses the minimality flag, it is usually not a good idea (various processors need this flag, including usable rules!) and can only be done once.

[9] Usual definitions of argument filterings also allow $\pi(f) = i$, giving $\overline{\pi}(f(\boldsymbol{s})) = \overline{\pi}(s_i)$, but for usable rules, $\pi(f) = i$ is treated the same as $\pi(f) = \{i\}$, cf. [9, Section 4].

3 Formative Rules

Where *usable rules* [1,9,10] are defined primarily by the right-hand sides of $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R}$, the *formative rules* discussed here are defined by the left-hand sides. This has consequences; most importantly, we cannot handle non-left-linear rules very well.

We fix a signature Σ. A term $s : \iota$ *has shape* f with $f : [\boldsymbol{\kappa}] \Rightarrow \iota \in \Sigma$ if either $s = f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, or s is a variable of sort ι. That is, there exists some γ with $s\gamma = f(\ldots)$: one can *specialise* s to have f as its root symbol.

Definition 7. *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a set of rules. The* basic formative rules *of a term t are defined as the smallest set $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that:*

- *if t is not linear, then $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t_i, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R})$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $\{\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r \text{ has shape } f\} \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R})$;*
- *if $\ell \to r \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R})$, then $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R})$.*

For rules $\mathcal{P}$, let $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R})$. Note that $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(x, \mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$.

Note the strong symmetry with Definition 5. We have omitted the argument filtering π here, because the definitions are simpler without it. In Section 4 we will see how we can add argument filterings back in without changing the definition.

Example 8. In the system from Example 1, consider $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(x, y), \mathtt{Upd}(z))\}$. The symbols in the left-hand side are just $\mathtt{Big}^\sharp$ (which has sort $\mathtt{dpsort}$, which is not used in $\mathcal{R}$) and $\mathtt{Cons}$. Thus, $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = \{8\}$.

Intuitively, the formative rules of a dependency pair $\ell \to r$ are those rules which might contribute to creating the pattern ℓ. In Example 8, to reduce a term $\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(\mathtt{O}), \mathtt{O}), \mathtt{Upd}(\mathtt{Cons}(\mathtt{O}, \mathtt{Nil})))$ to an instance of $\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z))$, a single step with the $\mathtt{Upd}$ rule 8 gives $\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(\mathtt{O}), \mathtt{O}), \mathtt{Cons}(\mathtt{Rnd}(\mathtt{O}), \mathtt{Upd}(\mathtt{Nil})))$; we need not reduce the $\mathtt{Ack}()$ or $\mathtt{Rnd}()$ subterms for this. To create a *non*-linear pattern, any rule could contribute, as a step deep inside a term may be needed.

Example 9. Consider $\Sigma = \{\mathtt{a}, \mathtt{b} : \mathtt{A}, \mathtt{f}^\sharp : [\mathtt{B} \times \mathtt{B}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{dpsort}, \mathtt{h} : [\mathtt{A}] \Rightarrow \mathtt{B}\}$, $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{b}\}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathtt{f}^\sharp(x, x) \to \mathtt{f}^\sharp(\mathtt{h}(\mathtt{a}), \mathtt{h}(\mathtt{b}))\}$. Without the linearity restriction, $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$ would be $\emptyset$, as $\mathtt{dpsort}$ does not occur in the rules and $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(x, \mathcal{R}) = \emptyset$. But there is no infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \emptyset)$-chain, while we do have an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain, with $\gamma_i = [x := \mathtt{h}(\mathtt{b})]$ for all i. The $\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{b}$ rule is needed to make $\mathtt{h}(\mathtt{a})$ and $\mathtt{h}(\mathtt{b})$ equal. Note that this happens even though the sort of x does not occur in $\mathcal{R}$!

Thus, as we will see, in an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain we can limit interest to rules in $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$. We call these *basic* formative rules because while they demonstrate the concept, in practice we would typically use more advanced extensions of the idea. For instance, following the *TCap* idea of [8, Definition 11], a rule $l \to f(\mathtt{O})$ does not need to be a formative rule of $f(\mathtt{S}(x)) \to r$ if $\mathtt{O}$ is a constructor.

To use formative rules with DPs, we will show that any $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain can be altered so that the $r_i\gamma_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$ reduction has a very specific form (which uses only formative rules of ℓ_{i+1}). To this end, we consider *formative reductions*. A formative reduction is a reduction where, essentially, a rewriting step is only done if it is needed to obtain a result of the right form.

Definition 10 (Formative Reduction). *For a term ℓ, substitution γ and term s, we say $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ by a* formative ℓ-reduction *if one of the following holds:*

1. *ℓ is non-linear;*
2. *ℓ is a variable and $s = \ell\gamma$;*
3. *$\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and each $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction;*
4. *$\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and there are a rule $\ell' \to r' \in \mathcal{R}$ and a substitution δ such that $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell'\delta$ by a formative ℓ'-reduction and $r'\delta = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ and each $t_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction.*

Point 2 is the key: a reduction $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* x\gamma$ must be postponed. Formative reductions are the base of a semantic definition of formative rules:

Definition 11. *A function FR that maps a term ℓ and a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$ to a set $FR(\ell, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ is a* formative rules approximation *if for all s and γ: if $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, then this reduction uses only rules in $FR(\ell, \mathcal{R})$.*

Given a formative rules approximation FR, let $FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR(s, \mathcal{R})$.

As might be expected, FR_{base} is indeed a formative rules approximation:

Lemma 12. *A formative ℓ-reduction $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ uses only rules in $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R})$.*

Proof. By induction on the definition of a formative ℓ-reduction. If ℓ is non-linear, then $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$, so this is clear. If $s = \ell\gamma$ then no rules play a part.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and each $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction, then by the induction hypothesis each formative l_i-reduction $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* l_i\gamma$ uses only rules in $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(l_i, \mathcal{R})$. Observing that by definition $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(l_i, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R})$, we see that all steps of the reduction use rules in $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R})$.

If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell'\delta \to_{\mathcal{R}} r'\delta = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)\gamma = \ell\gamma$, then by the same reasoning the reduction $r'\delta \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ uses only formative rules of ℓ, and by the induction hypothesis $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell'\delta$ uses only formative rules of ℓ'. Noting that r' obviously has the same sort as ℓ, and either r' is a variable or a term $f(r'_1, \ldots, r'_n)$, we see that r' has shape f, so $\ell' \to r' \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R})$. Therefore $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell', \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R})$, so all rules in the reduction are formative rules of ℓ. □

In the following, we will assume a fixed formative rules approximation FR. The relevance of formative rules is clear from their definition: if we can prove that a $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain can be altered to use formative reductions in the $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$ steps, then we can drop all non-formative rules from a DP problem.

The key result in this paper is the following technical lemma, which allows us to alter a reduction $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ to a formative reduction (by changing γ):

Lemma 13. *If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\gamma$ for some terms s, ℓ and a substitution γ on domain $Var(\ell)$, then there is a substitution δ on the same domain such that $s \to_{FR(\ell,\mathcal{R})}^* \ell\delta$ by a formative ℓ-reduction.*

Proof. For non-linear ℓ this is clear, choosing $\delta := \gamma$. So let ℓ be a linear term. By definition of FR, it suffices to see that $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\delta$ by a formative ℓ-reduction. This follows from the following claim: *If $s \mathrel{-\!\!\!\shortparallel\!\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^k} \ell\gamma$ for some k, term s, linear term ℓ and substitution γ on domain $Var(\ell)$, then there is a substitution δ on $Var(\ell)$ such that $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell\delta$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, and each $\delta(x) \mathrel{-\!\!\!\shortparallel\!\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^k} \gamma(x)$.*

Here, the parallel reduction relation $\parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is defined by: $x \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} x$; $\ell\gamma \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} r\gamma$ for $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$; if $s_i \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} t_i$ for $1 \le i \le n$, then $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$. The notation $\parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k}$ indicates k *or fewer* successive $\parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ steps. Note that $\parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}$ is reflexive, and if each $s_i \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{N_i} t_i$, then $f(\boldsymbol{s}) \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{\max(N_1,\ldots,N_n)} f(\boldsymbol{t})$.

We prove the claim by induction first on k, second on the size of ℓ.

If ℓ is a variable we are immediately done, choosing $\delta := [\ell := s]$.

Otherwise, let $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and $\gamma = \gamma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \gamma_n$ such that all γ_i have disjoint domains and each $l_i\gamma_i = l_i\gamma$; this is possible due to linearity.

First suppose the reduction $s \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k} \ell\gamma$ uses no topmost steps. Thus, we can write $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and each $s_i \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k} l_i\gamma$. By the second induction hypothesis we can find $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$ such that each $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} l_i\delta_i$ by a formative l_i-reduction and each $\delta_i(x) \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k} \gamma_i(x)$. Choose $\delta := \delta_1 \cup \ldots \cup \delta_n$; this is well-defined by the assumption on the disjoint domains. Then $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} \ell\delta$ by a formative ℓ-reduction.

Alternatively, a topmost step was done, which cannot be parallel with other steps: $s \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{m} \ell'\gamma' \to_{\mathcal{R}} r'\gamma' \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k-m-1} \ell\gamma$ for some $\ell' \to r' \in \mathcal{R}$ and substitution γ'; we can safely assume that $r'\gamma' \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k-m-1} \ell\gamma$ does not use topmost steps (otherwise we could just choose a later step). Since $m < k$, the first induction hypothesis provides δ' such that $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} \ell'\delta'$ by a formative ℓ'-reduction and each $\delta'(x) \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{m} \gamma'(x)$. But then also $r'\delta' \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{m} r'\gamma'$. Since $r'\gamma' \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k-m-1} \ell\gamma$, we have that $r'\delta' \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k-1} \ell\gamma$. Thus, by the first induction hypothesis, there is δ such that $r'\delta' \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} \ell\delta$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, and each $\delta(x) \parallel\!\!\rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}}^{k-1} \gamma(x)$.

We are done if the full reduction $s \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} \ell'\delta' \to_{\mathcal{R}} r'\delta' \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{*} \ell\delta$ is ℓ-formative; this is easy with induction on the number of topmost steps in the second part. □

Lemma 13 lays the foundation for all theorems in this paper. To start:

Theorem 14. *$(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ is non-terminating if and only if there is an infinite minimal formative $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), FR(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}))$-chain. Here, a chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is* formative *if always $r_i\gamma_i \to_{FR(\ell_{i+1},\mathcal{R})}^{*} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$ by a formative ℓ_{i+1}-reduction.*

Proof Sketch: Construct an infinite $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R})$-chain following the usual proof, but when choosing γ_{i+1}, use Lemma 13 to guarantee that $r_i\gamma_i \to_{FR(\ell_{i+1},\mathcal{R})}^{*} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$ by a formative ℓ_{i+1}-reduction. □

Note that this theorem extends the standard dependency pairs result (Theorem 3) by limiting interest to chains with formative reductions.

Example 15. The system from Example 1 is terminating iff there is no infinite minimal formative $(\mathcal{P}, Q)$-chain, where $\mathcal{P} = \mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R})$ from Example 2 and $Q = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11\}$. Rules 4 and 9 have right-hand sides headed by symbols `Err` and `Return` which do not occur in the left-hand sides of DP or its formative rules.

4 Formative Rules in the Dependency Pair Framework

Theorem 14 provides a basis for using DPs with formative rules to prove termination: instead of proving that there is no infinite minimal $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R})$-chain, it suffices if there is no infinite minimal formative $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), FR(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}))$-chain. So in the DP framework, we can start with the set $\{(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), FR(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}), \mathsf{m})\}$ instead of $\{(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m})\}$, as we did in Example 15. We thus obtain a similar

improvement to Dershowitz' refinement [3] in that it yields a smaller *initial* DP problem: by [3], we can reduce the initial set $\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R})$; by Theorem 14 we can reduce the initial set $\mathcal{R}$. However, there (currently) is no way to keep track of the information that we only need to consider formative chains. Despite this, we can define several processors. All of them are based on this consequence of Lemma 13:

Lemma 16. *If there is a $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$, then there are δ_i for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is a formative $(\mathcal{P}, FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}))$-chain.*

Proof. Given $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ we construct the formative chain as follows. Let $\delta_1 := \gamma_1$. For given i, suppose δ_i is a substitution such that $\delta_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \gamma_i$, so still $r_i\delta_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$. Use Lemma 13 to find δ_{i+1} such that $r_i\delta_i \to^*_{FR(\ell_{i+1},\mathcal{R})} \ell_{i+1}\delta_{i+1}$ by a formative ℓ_{i+1}-reduction, and moreover $\delta_{i+1} \to_{\mathcal{R}}^* \gamma_{i+1}$. □

This lemma for instance allows us to remove all non-formative rules from a DP problem. To this end, we use the following processor:

Theorem 17. *The DP processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f)$ to the set $\{(\mathcal{P}, FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}), \mathsf{a})\}$ is sound.*

Proof Sketch: This follows immediately from Lemma 16. □

Example 18. Let $Q = FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}),\mathcal{R})$ from Example 15, and let $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y,z)) \to \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(x,y), \mathtt{Upd}(z))\}$ as in Example 8. If, during a termination proof with dependency pairs, we encounter a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, Q, \mathsf{m})$, we can soundly replace it by $(\mathcal{P}, T, \mathsf{a})$, where $T = FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, Q) = \{8\}$.

Thus, we can (permanently) remove all non-formative rules from a dependency pair problem. This processor has a clear downside, however: given a problem $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\mathsf{m})$, we lose minimality. This m flag is very convenient to have, as several processors require it (such as reduction pairs with usable rules from Theorem 6).

Could we preserve minimality? Unfortunately, the answer is no. By modifying a chain to use formative reductions, we may lose the property that each $r_i\gamma_i$ is terminating. This happens for instance for $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\mathsf{m})$, where $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathtt{g}^\sharp(x) \to \mathtt{h}^\sharp(\mathtt{f}(x)),\ \mathtt{h}^\sharp(\mathtt{c}) \to \mathtt{g}^\sharp(\mathtt{a})\}$ and $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{b},\ \mathtt{f}(x) \to \mathtt{c},\ \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{a}) \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{a})\}$. Here, $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}) = \{\mathtt{f}(x) \to \mathtt{c},\ \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{a}) \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{a})\}$. While there is an infinite minimal $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})$-chain, the only infinite $(\mathcal{P}, FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}))$-chain is non-minimal.

Fortunately, there *is* an easy way to use formative rules without losing any information: by using them in a reduction pair, as we typically do for usable rules. In fact, although usable and formative rules seem to be opposites, there is no reason why we should use either one or the other; we can combine them. Considering also argument filterings, we find the following extension of Theorem 6.

Theorem 19. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- *$\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ if:*
  - *$\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ for $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^\succ$ and $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ for $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ$;*
  - *$u \succsim v$ for $u \to v \in FR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(U))$,*
    where $U = \mathcal{R}$ if $f = \mathsf{a}$ and $U = UR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ if $f = \mathsf{m}$;
- *$\{(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f)\}$ otherwise.*

Proof Sketch: Given an infinite $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})$-chain, we use argument filterings and maybe usable rules to obtain a $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(U))$-chain which uses the same dependency pairs infinitely often (as in [9]); using Lemma 16 we turn this chain formative. □

Note that we use the argument filtering here in a slightly different way than for usable rules: rather than including π in the definition of FR and requiring that $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \gtrsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ for $\ell \to r \in FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)$, we simply use $FR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$. We give additional semantic and syntactic definitions of formative rules with respect to an argument filtering in Appendix C.

Example 20. To handle $(\mathcal{P},Q,\mathsf{m})$ from Example 18, we can alternatively use a reduction pair. Using the trivial argument filtering, with a polynomial interpretation with $\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x,y) = x+y$, $\mathtt{Ack}(x,y) = 0$, $\mathtt{Upd}(x) = x$ and $\mathtt{Cons}(x,y) = y+1$, all constraints are oriented, and we may remove the only element of $\mathcal{P}$.

Note that we *could* have handled this example without using formative rules; `Ack` and `Rnd` can be oriented with an extension of $\gtrsim$, or we might use an argument filtering with $\pi(\mathtt{Big}^\sharp) = \{2\}$. Both objections could be cancelled by adding extra rules, but we kept the example short, as it suffices to illustrate the method.

Discussion It is worth noting the parallels between formative and usable rules. To start, their definitions are very similar; although we did not present the semantic definition of usable rules from [16] (which is only used for *innermost* termination), the syntactic definitions are almost symmetric. Also the usage corresponds: in both cases, we lose minimality when using the direct rule removing processor, but can safely use the restriction in a reduction pair (with argument filterings).

There are also differences, however. The transformations used to turn a chain usable or formative are very different, with the usable rules transformation (which we did not discuss) encoding subterms whose root is not usable, while the formative rules transformation is simply a matter of postponing reduction steps.

Due to this difference, usable rules are useful only for a finitely branching system (which is standard, as all finite MTRSs are finitely branching); formative rules are useful mostly for left-linear systems (also usual, especially in MTRSs originating from functional programming, but typically seen as a larger restriction). Usable rules introduce the extra $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ rules, while formative rules are all included in the original rules. But for formative rules, even definitions extending FR_{base}, necessarily all collapsing rules are included, which has no parallel in usable rules; the parallel of collapsing rules would be rules $x \to r$, which are not permitted.

To use formative rules without losing minimality information, an alternative to Theorem 17 allows us to permanently delete rules. The trick is to add a new component to DP problems, as for higher-order rewriting in [11, Ch. 7]. A DP problem becomes a tuple $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f_1,f_2)$, with $f_1 \in \{\mathsf{m},\mathsf{a}\}$ and $f_2 \in \{\mathsf{form},\mathsf{arbitrary}\}$, and is finite if there is no infinite $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})$-chain which is minimal if $f_1 = \mathsf{m}$, and formative if $f_2 = \mathsf{form}$. By Theorem 14, $\mathcal{R}$ is terminating iff $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}),\mathcal{R},\mathsf{m},\mathsf{form})$ is finite.

Theorem 21. *In the extended DP framework, the processor which maps* $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f_1,f_2)$ *to* $\{(\mathcal{P},FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}),f_1,f_2)\}$ *if* $f_2 = \mathsf{form}$ *and* $\{(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f_1,f_2)\}$ *otherwise, is sound.*

Proof: This follows immediately from Lemma 12. □

The downside of changing the DP framework in this way is that we have to revisit all existing DP processors to see how they interact with the formative flag. In many cases, we can simply pass the flag on unmodified (i.e. if $proc((\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f_1)) = A$, then $proc'((\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f_1, f_2)) = \{(\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{R}', f_1', f_2) \mid (\mathcal{P}', \mathcal{R}', f_1') \in A\}$). This is for example the case for processors with reduction pairs (like the one in Theorem 19), the dependency graph and the subterm criterion. Other processors would have to be checked individually, or reset the flag to arbitrary by default.

Given how long the dependency pair framework has existed (and how many processors have been defined, see e.g. [16]), and that the formative flag clashes with the component for innermost rewriting (see Section 6), it is unlikely that many tool programmers will make the effort for a single rule-removing processor.

5 Handling the Collapsing Rules Problem

A great weakness of the formative rules method is the matter of collapsing rules. Whenever the left-hand side of a dependency pair or formative rule has a symbol $f : [\boldsymbol{\iota}] \Rightarrow \kappa$, all collapsing rules of sort κ are formative. And then all *their* formative rules are also formative. Thus, this often leads to the inclusion of all rules of a given sort. In particular for systems with only one sort (such as all first-order benchmarks in the Termination Problems Data Base), this is problematic.

For this reason, we will consider a new notion, building on the idea of formative rules and reductions. This notion is based on the observation that it might suffice to include *composite rules* rather than the formative rules of all collapsing rules. To illustrate the idea, assume given a uni-sorted system with rules $\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{b})$ and $\mathtt{f}(x) \to x$. $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathtt{c})$ includes $\mathtt{f}(x) \to x$, so also $\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{b})$. But a term $\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{b})$ does not reduce to $\mathtt{c}$. So intuitively, we should not really need to include the first rule.

Instead of including the formative rules of all collapsing rules, we might imagine a system where we *combine* rules with collapsing rules that could follow them. In the example above, this gives $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{b}),\ \mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{b},\ \mathtt{f}(x) \to x\}$. Now we might consider an alternative definition of formative rules, where we still need to include the collapsing rule $\mathtt{f}(x) \to x$, but no longer need to have $\mathtt{a} \to \mathtt{f}(\mathtt{b})$.

To make this idea formal, we first consider how rules can be combined. In the following, we consider systems with *only one sort*; this is needed for the definition to be well-defined, but can always be achieved by replacing all sorts by $\mathtt{o}$.

Definition 22 (Combining Rules). *Given an MTRS $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$, let $A := \{f(\boldsymbol{x}) \to x_i \mid f : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma \wedge 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $B := \{\ell \to p \mid \ell \to r \in \mathcal{R} \wedge r \trianglerighteq p\}$. Let $X \subseteq A \cup B$ be the smallest set such that $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X$ and for all $\ell \to r \in X$:*

a. if r is a variable, $\ell \trianglerighteq f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and $l_i \trianglerighteq r$, then $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \to x_i \in X$;
b. if $r = f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ and $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \to x_i \in X$, then $\ell \to r_i \in X$.

Let $Cl := A \cap X$ and $NC = \{\ell \to r \in X \mid r \text{ not a variable}\}$. Let $A_{\mathcal{R}} := Cl \cup NC$.

It is easy to see that $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^*$ is included in $\to_{A_{\mathcal{R}}}^*$: all non-collapsing rules of $\mathcal{R}$ are in NC, and all collapsing rules are obtained as a concatenation of steps in Cl.

Example 23. Consider an unsorted version of Example 1. Then for $(\mathcal{P}, Q)$ as in Example 18, we have $U := UR(\mathcal{P}, Q) = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11\}$. Unfortunately, only (3)

is not formative, as the two $\mathtt{Rnd}$ rules cause inclusion of all rules in $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathtt{S}(x), U)$. Let us instead calculate X, which we do as an iterative procedure starting from $\mathcal{R}$. In the following, $C \Rightarrow D_1, \ldots, D_n$ should be read as: "by requirement a, rule C enforces inclusion of each D_i", and $C, D \Rightarrow E$ similarly refers to requirement b.

$$\begin{array}{lllll} 2,1 \Rightarrow 12 & 5,13 \Rightarrow 14 & 10,15 \Rightarrow 16 & 16,13 \Rightarrow 18 & 17,15 \Rightarrow 19 \\ 12 \Rightarrow 1,13 & 14 \Rightarrow 15 & 11,15 \Rightarrow 17 & 18 \Rightarrow 15,13 & 19 \Rightarrow 15,13 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lll} 12.\ \mathtt{Rnd}(\mathtt{S}(x)) \to x & 15.\ \mathtt{Ack}(x,y) \to y & 18.\ \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x),y) \to y \\ 13.\ \mathtt{S}(x) \to x & 16.\ \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x),y) \to \mathtt{S}(y) & 19.\ \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x),\mathtt{S}(y)) \to y \\ 14.\ \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{O},y) \to y & 17.\ \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x),\mathtt{S}(y)) \to \mathtt{Ack}(\mathtt{S}(x),y) & \end{array}$$

Now $Cl = \{1, 13, 15\}$ and $NC = \{2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17\}$, and $A_U = Cl \cup NC$.

Although combining a system $\mathcal{R}$ into $A_{\mathcal{R}}$ may create significantly more rules, the result is not necessarily harder to handle. For many standard reduction pairs, like RPO or linear polynomials over $\mathbb{N}$, we have: if $s \succsim x$ where $x \in Var(s)$ occurs exactly once, then $f(\ldots, t, \ldots) \succsim t$ for any t with $s \trianglerighteq t \trianglerighteq x$. For such a reduction pair, $A_{\mathcal{R}}$ can be oriented whenever $\mathcal{R}$ can be (if $\mathcal{R}$ is left-linear).

$A_{\mathcal{R}}$ has the advantage that we never need to follow a non-collapsing rule $l \to f(\boldsymbol{r})$ by a collapsing step. This is essential to use the following definition:

Definition 24. *Let A be a set of rules. The* split-formative rules *of a term t are defined as the smallest set $SR(t, A) \subseteq A$ such that:*

- *if t is not linear, then $SR(t, A) = A$;*
- *all collapsing rules in A are included in $SR(t, A)$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $SR(t_i, A) \subseteq SR(t, A)$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then $\{\ell \to r \in A \mid r \text{ has the form } f(\ldots)\} \subseteq SR(t, A)$;*
- *if $\ell \to r \in SR(t, A)$ and r is not a variable, then $SR(\ell, A) \subseteq SR(t, A)$.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$, we define $SR(\mathcal{P}, A) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} SR(s, A)$.

Definition 24 is an alternative definition of formative rules, where collapsing rules have a smaller effect (differences to Definition 7 are highlighted). *SR* is *not* a formative rules approximation, as shown by the $\mathtt{a}$-formative reduction $\mathtt{f}(\mathtt{a}) \to_{\mathcal{R}} \mathtt{g}(\mathtt{a}) \to_{\mathcal{R}} \mathtt{a}$ with $\mathcal{R} = \{\mathtt{f}(x) \to \mathtt{g}(x),\ \mathtt{g}(x) \to x\}$ but $SR(\mathtt{a}, \mathcal{R}) = \{\mathtt{g}(x) \to x\}$. However, given the relation between $\mathcal{R}$ and $A_{\mathcal{R}}$, we find a similar result to Lemma 12:

Lemma 25. *Let $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ be an MTRS. If $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, then $s \to^*_{SR(\ell, A_{\mathcal{R}})} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction.*

Unlike Lemma 12, the altered reduction might be different. We also do not have that $SR(\mathcal{P}, A_{\mathcal{R}}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. Nevertheless, by this lemma we can use split-formative rules in reduction pair processors with formative rules, such as Theorem 19.

Proof Sketch: The original reduction $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ gives rise to a formative reduction over $A_{\mathcal{R}}$, simply replacing collapsing steps by a sequence of rules in Cl. So, we assume given a formative ℓ-reduction over $A_{\mathcal{R}}$, and prove with induction first on the number of non-collapsing steps in the reduction, second on the length of the reduction, third on the size of s, that $s \to^*_{SR(\ell, A_{\mathcal{R}})} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction.

This is mostly easy with the induction hypotheses; note that if a root-rule in NC is followed by a rule in Cl, there can be no internal $\to^*_{\mathcal{R}}$ reduction in between

(as this would not be a formative reduction); combining a rule in NC with a rule in Cl gives either a rule in NC (and a continuation with the second induction hypothesis) or a sequence of rules in Cl (and the first induction hypothesis). □

Note that this method unfortunately does not transpose directly to the higher-order setting, where collapsing rules may have more complex forms. We also had to give up sort differentiation, as otherwise we might not be able to flatten a rule $f(g(x)) \to x$ into $f(x) \to x,\ g(x) \to x$. This is not such a great problem, as reduction pairs typically do not care about sorts, and we circumvented the main reason why sorts are important for formative rules. We have the following result:

Theorem 26. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *if:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$*;*
  - $u \succsim v$ *for* $u \to v \in SR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), A_{\overline{\pi}(U)})$ *and* $Var(t) \subseteq Var(s)$ *for* $s \to t \in \overline{\pi}(U)$*, where* $U = \mathcal{R}$ *if* $f = \mathsf{a}$ *and* $U = UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ *if* $f = \mathsf{m}$*;*
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof Sketch: Like Theorem 19, but using Lemma 25 to alter the created formative $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(U))$-chain to a split-formative $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), SR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), A_{\overline{\pi}(U)}))$-chain. □

Example 27. Following Example 23, $SR(\mathtt{Big}^\sharp(x, \mathtt{Cons}(y, z)) \to \mathtt{Big}^\sharp(\mathtt{Ack}(x, y), \mathtt{Upd}(z)), A_U) = Cl \cup \{8\}$, and Theorem 26 gives an easily orientable problem.

6 Formative Rules for Innermost Termination

So far, we have considered only *full termination*. A very common related query is *innermost termination*; that is, termination of $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathsf{in}}$, defined by:

- $f(\boldsymbol{l})\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathsf{in}} r\gamma$ if $f(\boldsymbol{l}) \to r \in \mathcal{R}$, γ a substitution and all $l_i\gamma$ in normal form;
- $f(s_1, \ldots, s_i, \ldots, s_n) \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathsf{in}} f(s_1, \ldots, s_i', \ldots, s_n)$ if $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathsf{in}} s_i'$.

The innermost reduction relation is often used in for instance program analysis.

An innermost strategy can be included in the dependency pair framework by adding the $\mathsf{innermost}$ flag [9] to DP problems (or, more generally, a component $\mathcal{Q}$ [7] which indicates that when reducing any term with $\to_{\mathcal{P}}$ or $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$, its strict subterms must be normal with respect to $\mathcal{Q}$). Usable rules are more viable for innermost than normal termination: we do not need minimality, the $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ rules do not need to be handled by the reduction pair, and we can define a sound processor that maps $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f, \mathsf{innermost})$ to $\{(\mathcal{P}, UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}), f, \mathsf{innermost})\}$.

This is not the case for formative rules. Innermost reductions eagerly evaluate arguments, yet formative reductions postpone evaluations as long as possible. In a way, these are exact opposites. Thus, it should not be surprising that formative rules are *weaker* for innermost termination than for full termination. Theorem 14 has no counterpart for $\to_{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathsf{in}}$; for innermost termination we must start the DP framework with $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{innermost})$, not with $(\mathcal{P}, FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}), \mathsf{m}, \mathsf{innermost})$. Theorem 17 is only sound if the innermost flag is removed: $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f, \mathsf{innermost})$ is mapped to $\{(\mathcal{P}, FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}), \mathsf{a}, \mathsf{arbitrary})\}$. Still, we *can* safely use formative rules with reduction pairs. For example, we obtain this variation of Theorem 19:

Theorem 28. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f_1, f_2)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, f_1, f_2)\}$ *if:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$*;*
  - $u \succsim v$ *for* $u \to v \in FR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(U))$*, where* U *is:* $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ *if* $f_2 =$ innermost*; otherwise* $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ *if* $f_1 = \mathsf{m}$*; otherwise* $\mathcal{R}$*.*
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f_1, f_2)\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof Sketch: The proof of Theorem 19 still applies; we just ignore that the given chain might be innermost (aside from getting more convenient usable rules). □

Theorem 26 extends to innermost termination in a similar way.

Conveniently, innermost termination is *persistent* [4], so modifying Σ does not alter innermost termination behaviour, as long as all rules stay well-sorted. In practice, we could infer a typing with as many different sorts as possible, and get stronger formative-rules-with-reduction-pair processors. With the *innermost switch processor* [16, Thm. 3.14], which in cases can set the innermost flag on a DP problem, we could also often use this trick even for proving full termination.

In Section 4, we used the extra flag f_2 as the formative flag. It is not contradictory to use f_2 in both ways, allowing $f_2 \in \{\mathsf{arbitrary}, \mathsf{form}, \mathsf{innermost}\}$, since it is very unlikely for a $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain to be both formative and innermost at once! When using both extensions of the DP framework together, termination provers (human or computer) will, however, sometimes have to make a choice which flag to add.

7 Implementation and Experiments

We have performed a preliminary implementation of formative rules in the termination tool AProVE [6]. Our automation borrows from the usable rules of [8] (see Appendices B + D) and uses a constraint encoding [2] for a combined search for argument filterings and corresponding formative rules. While we did not find any termination proofs for examples from the TPDB where none were known before, our experiments show that formative rules do improve the power of reduction pairs for widely used term orders (e.g., polynomial orders [14]). For more information, see also: `http://aprove.informatik.rwth-aachen.de/eval/Formative`

For instance, we experimented with a configuration where we applied dependency pairs, and then alternatingly dependency graph decomposition and reduction pairs with linear polynomials and coefficients ≤ 3. On the TRS Standard category of the TPDB (v8.0.7) with 1493 examples, this configuration (without formative rules, but with usable rules w.r.t. an argument filter) shows termination of 579 examples within a timeout of 60 seconds (on an Intel Xeon 5140 at 2.33 GHz). With additional formative rules, our implementation of Theorem 19 proved termination of 6 additional TRSs. (We did, however, lose 4 examples to timeouts, which we believe are due in part to the currently unoptimised implementation.)

The split-formative rules from Theorem 26 are not a subset of $\mathcal{R}$, in contrast to the usable rules. Thus, it is *a priori* not clear how to combine their encodings w.r.t. an argument filtering, and we conducted experiments using only the standard usable rules. Without formative rules, 532 examples are proved terminating. In

contrast, adding either the formative rules of Theorem 19 or the split-formative rules of Theorem 26 we solved 6 additional examples each (where Theorem 19 and Theorem 26 each had 1 example the other could not solve), losing 1 to timeouts.

Finally, we experimented with the improved dependency pair transformation based on Theorem 14, which drops non-formative rules from $\mathcal{R}$. We applied DPs as the first technique on the 1403 TRSs from TRS Standard with at least one DP. This reduced the number of rules in the initial DP problem for 618 of these TRSs, without any search problems and without sacrificing minimality.

Thus, our current impression is that while formative rules are not the next "killer technique", they nonetheless provide additional power to widely-used orders in an elegant way and reduce the number of term constraints to be solved in a termination proof. The examples from the TPDB are all untyped, and we believe that formative rules may have a greater impact in a typed first-order setting.

8 Conclusions

In this paper, we have simplified the notion of formative rules from [13] to the first-order setting, and integrated it in the DP framework. We did so by means of *formative reductions*, which allows us to obtain a semantic definition of formative rules (more extensive syntactic definitions are discussed in the appendix).

We have defined three processors to use formative rules in the standard dependency pair framework for full termination: one is a processor to permanently remove rules, the other two combine formative rules with a reduction pair.

We also discussed how to strengthen the method by adding a new flag to the framework – although doing so might require too many changes to existing processors and strategies to be considered worthwhile – and how we can still use the technique in the innermost case, and even profit from the innermost setting.

Related Work In the first-order DP framework two processors stand out as relevant to formative rules. The first is, of course, usable rules; see Section 4 for a detailed discussion. The second is the *dependency graph*, which determines whether any two dependency pairs can follow each other in a $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain, and uses this information to eliminate elements of $\mathcal{P}$, or to split $\mathcal{P}$ in multiple parts.

In state-of-the-art implementations of the dependency graph (see e.g. [16]), both left- and right-hand side of dependency pairs are considered to see whether a pair can be preceded or followed by another pair. Therefore it seems quite surprising that the same mirroring was not previously tried for usable rules.

Formative rules *have* been previously defined, for higher-order term rewriting, in [13], which introduces a limited DP framework, with formative rules (but not formative reductions) included in the definition of a chain: we simply impose the restriction that always $r_i\gamma_i \to^*_{FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$. This gives a reduction pair processor which considers only formative rules, although it cannot be combined with usable rules and argument filterings. The authors do not yet consider rule removing processors, but if they did, Theorem 21 would also go through.

In the second author's PhD thesis [11], a more complete higher-order DP framework is considered. Here, we do see formative reductions, and a variation

of Lemma 13 which, however, requires that s is terminating: the proof style used here does not go through there due to β-reduction. Consequently, Lemma 16 does not go through in the higher-order setting, and there is no counterpart to Theorems 17 or 19. We *do*, however, have Theorem 21. Furthermore, the results of Section 5 are entirely new to this paper, and do not apply in the higher-order setting, where rules might also have a form $l \to x \cdot s_1 \cdots s_n$ (with x a variable).

Future Work In the future, it would be interesting to look back at higher-order rewriting, and see whether we can obtain some form of Lemma 16 after all. Alternatively, we might be able to use the specific form of formative chains to obtain formative (and usable) rules w.r.t. an argument filtering.

In the first-order setting, we might turn our attention to non-left-linear rules. Here, we could think for instance of renaming apart some of these variables; a rule $f(x,x) \to g(x,x)$ could become any of $f(x,y) \to g(x,y),\ f(x,y) \to g(y,x),\ \ldots$

References

1. T. Arts and J. Giesl. Termination of term rewriting using dependency pairs. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 236(1-2):133–178, 2000.
2. M. Codish, J. Giesl, P. Schneider-Kamp, and R. Thiemann. SAT solving for termination proofs with recursive path orders and dependency pairs. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 49(1):53–93, 2012.
3. N. Dershowitz. Termination by abstraction. In *Proc. ICLP '04*, 2004.
4. C. Fuhs, J. Giesl, M. Parting, P. Schneider-Kamp, and S. Swiderski. Proving termination by dependency pairs and inductive theorem proving. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 47(2):133–160, 2011.
5. C. Fuhs and C. Kop. First-order formative rules. In *Proc. RTA-TLCA '14*, 2014. To appear.
6. J. Giesl, M. Brockschmidt, F. Emmes, F. Frohn, C. Fuhs, C. Otto, M. Plücker, P. Schneider-Kamp, T. Ströder, S. Swiderski, and R. Thiemann. Proving termination of programs automatically with AProVE. In *Proc. IJCAR '14*, 2014. To appear.
7. J. Giesl, R. Thiemann, and P. Schneider-Kamp. The dependency pair framework: Combining techniques for automated termination proofs. In *Proc. LPAR '04*. 2005.
8. J. Giesl, R. Thiemann, and P. Schneider-Kamp. Proving and disproving termination of higher-order functions. In *Proc. FroCoS '05*, 2005.
9. J. Giesl, R. Thiemann, P. Schneider-Kamp, and S. Falke. Mechanizing and improving dependency pairs. *Journal of Automated Reasoning*, 37(3):155–203, 2006.
10. N. Hirokawa and A. Middeldorp. Tyrolean termination tool: Techniques and features. *Information and Computation*, 205(4):474–511, 2007.
11. C. Kop. *Higher Order Termination*. PhD thesis, Vrije Univ. Amsterdam, 2012.
12. C. Kop and F. van Raamsdonk. Higher order dependency pairs for algebraic functional systems. In *Proc. RTA '11*, 2011.
13. C. Kop and F. van Raamsdonk. Dynamic dependency pairs for algebraic functional systems. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(2), 2012.
14. D. Lankford. On proving term rewriting systems are Noetherian. Technical Report MTP-3, Louisiana Technical University, 1979.
15. V. Tannen and G.H. Gallier. Polymorphic rewriting conserves algebraic strong normalization. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 83(1):3–28, 1991.
16. R. Thiemann. *The DP framework for proving termination of term rewriting*. PhD thesis, RWTH Aachen, 2007.

A Omitted Proofs

A.1 Conventions and Basic Proofs

In this appendix, we will use the following conventions:

- If A is a function mapping terms to terms and γ is a substitution, then γ^A indicates the substitution on the same domain as γ such that always $\gamma^A(x) = A(\gamma(x))$.
- A relation $\to^{=}_{\mathcal{R}}$ indicates 0 or 1 steps with $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$ (this is a sub-relation of $\to^{*}_{\mathcal{R}}$).
- Whenever we write $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, we implicitly mean that $i_1 < \ldots < i_k$.
- If $\pi(f) = \{1, \ldots, \mathit{arity}(f)\}$, then we identify f_π and f. Here, *arity* refers to the number of arguments a function symbol might take: if $f : [\iota_1 \times \ldots \times \iota_n] \Rightarrow \kappa \in \Sigma$ then $\mathit{arity}(f) = n$.

The following results about filtering will be useful on several occasions, as filtering plays an important role in several of our theorems.

Lemma 29. *For all terms s and substitutions γ: $\overline{\pi}(s\gamma) = \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$*

Proof. By induction on s.

If s is a variable, then $\overline{\pi}(s\gamma) = \overline{\pi}(\gamma(s)) = \gamma^{\overline{\pi}}(s) = \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ with $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, then by the induction hypothesis:

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\pi}(s\gamma) &= \overline{\pi}(f(s_1\gamma, \ldots, s_n\gamma)) \\
&= f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}\gamma), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}\gamma)) \\
&= f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1})\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}, \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k})\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}) \\
&= f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))\gamma^{\overline{\pi}} \\
&= \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 30. *For all terms s, t: if $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$ then $\overline{\pi}(s) \to^{=}_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} \overline{\pi}(t)$.*

Note that this lemma holds for any set $\mathcal{R}$, so also for a set $\mathcal{R} = \{\ell \to r\}$. Thus, we know that a filtered version of the same rule is used.

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_j, \ldots, s_n)$ and $t = f(s_1, \ldots, t_j, \ldots, s_n)$ with $s_j \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_j$ and $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, then we consider two possibilities. If $j = i_l$ for some l, then $\overline{\pi}(s) = f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_l}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k})) \to^{=}_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(t_{i_l}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))$ by the induction hypothesis, $= f_\pi(t)$. Otherwise, if $j \notin \pi(f)$, then $\overline{\pi}(s) = \overline{\pi}(t)$.

Alternatively, if the reduction takes place at the root, we can write $s = \ell\gamma$, $t = r\gamma$ for some $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$. Then $\overline{\pi}(s) = \overline{\pi}(\ell)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$ by Lemma 29, $\to_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} \overline{\pi}(r)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$ because $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \to \overline{\pi}(r) \in \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})$, and this is exactly $\overline{\pi}(t)$ by Lemma 29 again. □

A.2 Preliminaries Proofs

Theorems 3 and 4 are presented for understanding, but are not used in the proofs of other results in this paper. As they are moreover an immediate consequence of Theorems 14 and 19 (which are proved in much the same way in Section A.3), we do not prove them here, but simply refer to [1,7,9,10].

Theorem 6 is also a standard result from the literature [9,10], but this result (and even more important: the main lemma that leads to it) *is* used in other proofs. Moreover, seeing the proof will aid understanding for the not-entirely-standard proof in Appendix C. To start, we will need some definitions and lemmas.

Definition 31. *Fixing an argument filtering π and sets of rules $\mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathcal{R}$ is finitely branching, we introduce for any sort ι fresh symbols $\bot_\iota : \iota$ and $\mathsf{c}_\iota : [\iota \times \iota] \Rightarrow \iota$. The function $\mathcal{I}$ from* terminating *terms to terms is inductively defined by:*

- *if s is a variable, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = s$;*
- *if s has the form $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, with $f(\boldsymbol{s}) : \iota$ and $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, then:*
  - *if f is a* usable symbol***, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = f_\pi(\mathcal{I}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \mathcal{I}(s_{i_k}))$*
  - *otherwise, $\mathcal{I}(s) = \mathsf{c}_\iota(f_\pi(\mathcal{I}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \mathcal{I}(s_{i_k})), \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(\{t \mid f(\boldsymbol{s}) \to_{\mathcal{R}} t\}))$, where $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota$ is defined by:*
    - *$\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(\emptyset) = \bot_\iota$*
    - *$\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X) = \mathsf{c}_\iota(\mathcal{I}(t), \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X \setminus \{t\}))$ if X is non-empty and t is its smallest element (lexicographically).*

*** We say f is a usable symbol if either f is a constructor, or f is the root symbol of some rule in $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.*

This definition is well-defined because the system is finitely branching (so X is always finite) and terminating.

Definition 32. *We say a term is* completely π-usable *if either it is a variable, or it has the form $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ with f a usable symbol and for all $i \in \pi(f)$ also s_i is completely π-usable.*

This definition particularly applies to the right-hand sides of dependency pairs and usable rules which, by definition, are always completely π-usable.

Lemma 33. *For all substitutions γ and terms s we have $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$. If s is completely π-usable, then even $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

Proof. By induction on the size of s.

For a variable we easily see that $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = \mathcal{I}(\gamma(s)) = \gamma^{\mathcal{I}}(s) = \overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, let $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$. We either have that $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = f_\pi(\mathcal{I}(s_{i_1}\gamma), \ldots, \mathcal{I}(s_{i_k}\gamma))$, or $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma)$ reduces to this term with a single $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ step; the latter case cannot occur if s is completely π-usable, as then f would be a usable symbol. Either way, as $\overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} = f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1})\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}, \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k})\gamma^{\mathcal{I}})$ and all s_{i_j} are completely π-usable if s is, the induction hypothesis gives the desired result. □

Lemma 34. *If s is a terminating term and $\mathcal{R}$ finitely branching, and $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathcal{I}(t)$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$. Since s reduces, it cannot be a variable, so let us write $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, with $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$. For brevity, also denote $U := \overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$.

If f is not a usable symbol, then $\mathcal{I}(s) \to_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X)$, where X is a set which contains t. It is easy to see that therefore $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathcal{I}(t)$. Thus, let us henceforth assume that f is a usable symbol.

If $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n) = \ell\gamma$ and $t = r\gamma$ for some rule $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ and substitution γ. We can write $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$, and since f is a usable symbol, $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \to \overline{\pi}(r) \in U$. By Lemma 33, $\mathcal{I}(s) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \overline{\pi}(\ell)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to_U \overline{\pi}(r)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} = \mathcal{I}(r\gamma) = \mathcal{I}(t)$ as required, because the right-hand sides of usable rules are always completely π-usable.

Alternatively, $t = f(s_1, \ldots, s'_i, \ldots, s_n)$ with $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} s'_i$. If $i \notin \pi(f)$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = \mathcal{I}(t)$. Otherwise, by the induction hypothesis: $\mathcal{I}(s_i) \to^*_{U\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathcal{I}(s'_i)$. □

Lemma 35. *If there is an infinite minimal $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$, then there are $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ such that $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i) \to \overline{\pi}(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is an infinite $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon)$-chain.*

Note that, as long as we let $\pi(\mathsf{c}_\iota) = \{1, 2\}$ for all ι, we have $\overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon = \overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon)$. We will typically use the two interchangeably, and simply assume that the c_ι symbols are not filtered.

Proof. We can safely assume that the domains of all γ_i contain only variables in $Var(\ell_i) \cup Var(r_i)$; otherwise, we limit the domain as such.

The lemma is obvious if $\mathcal{R}$ is not finitely branching; otherwise $\mathcal{I}$ is defined on all terminating terms, such as the strict subterms of all $r_i\gamma_i$ and $\ell_i\gamma_i$. This includes all $\gamma_i(x)$ by the assumption. Thus, for all i, we define $\delta_i = \gamma_i^{\mathcal{I}}$. Then we have: $r_i\gamma \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell_{i+1}\gamma$ implies that $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i = \mathcal{I}(r_i\gamma_i)$ (by Lemma 33) $\to^*_{\overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon}$ $\mathcal{I}(l_i\gamma_{i+1})$ (by Lemma 34) $\to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \overline{\pi}(l_i)\delta_{i+1}$ (by Lemma 33). □

Proof (Proof of Theorem 6). Suppose there is an infinite minimal $(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$. By Lemma 35, we can find $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ such that $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i) \to \overline{\pi}(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is a chain. This new chain uses (filtered versions of) the same dependency pairs infinitely often, but uses $\overline{\pi}(UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ for the reduction $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^* \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}$. The requirements guarantee that the new chain cannot use filtered elements of $\mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ infinitely often. Hence, the original chain must have a tail without these pairs. □

A.3 Proofs for Sections 3–5

Proof (Proof of Theorem 14). To handle the *if* side, we refer to [1]: if there is an infinite minimal formative $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), FR(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}))$-chain, then there is an infinite $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R})$-chain, so $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ is non-terminating. For the *only if* side, let $(\Sigma, \mathcal{R})$ be non-terminating; we must find an infinite minimal formative $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), FR(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R}))$-chain. Note that by definition of an MTRS, the rules in $\mathcal{R}$ are required to satisfy the variable condition: always $Var(r) \subseteq Var(\ell)$.

Assume $\mathcal{R}$ is non-terminating, so there is a non-terminating term s_{-1}; without loss of generality we can assume that all subterms of s_{-1} do terminate.

For $i \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$, let a minimal non-terminating term s_i be given. By minimality, we know that any infinite reduction starting in s_i eventually has to take a root step, say $s_i = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} f(q_1, \ldots, q_n) = \ell\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}} r\gamma$ where $\ell \to r$ is a rule and $r\gamma$ is still non-terminating.

Write $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$. If ℓ is non-linear, a reduction $f^\sharp(\boldsymbol{t}) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} f^\sharp(\boldsymbol{l})\gamma$ is ℓ-formative; in this case let $\delta := \gamma$. If ℓ is linear, then by Lemma 13, we can find $\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n$ on the disjoint domains $Var(l_1), \ldots, Var(l_n)$ such that each $t_i \to^*_{FR(l_i,\mathcal{R})} l_i\delta_i$ by a formative l_i-reduction, and each $\delta_i(x) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \gamma(x)$; we define $\delta := \delta_1 \cup \ldots \cup \delta_n$ and note that $r\delta \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} r\gamma$ is also non-terminating.

Thus, either way we have a substitution δ such that $s_i \to^*_{FR(\ell,\mathcal{R})} f^\sharp(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, and $r\delta$ is still non-terminating. Let p be a minimal subterm of r such that $p\delta$ is still non-terminating. Then p cannot be a variable, as then $p\delta$ would be a subterm of some $l_j\delta$, contradicting termination of t_j. Thus, $p = g(p_1, \ldots, p_m)$. If g is not a defined symbol, then any infinite reduction starting in $p\delta$ would give an infinite reduction in some $p_i\delta$, contradicting minimality; so, g is defined. We conclude that $\ell_{i+1} := f^\sharp(\boldsymbol{l}) \to g^\sharp(\boldsymbol{p}) =: r_{i+1}$ is a dependency pair. Let $\gamma_{i+1} := \delta$ and $s_{i+1} := p\delta$.

This builds an infinite $(\mathsf{DP}(\mathcal{R}), \mathcal{R})$-chain with all $\to_{\mathcal{R}}$-steps formative! □

Proof (Proof of Theorem 17). Suppose $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ is not finite, so there is an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i, r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ with all $\ell_i \to r_i \in \mathcal{P}$ and always $r_i\gamma_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$. By Lemma 16 there is also an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}))$-chain. □

Proof (Proof of Theorem 19). We can safely assume that $\pi(\mathsf{c}_\iota) = \{1, 2\}$, as the c_ι symbols occur only in $\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$: if we can prove the theorem for such an argument filtering, then for general filterings ρ we write $\rho = \sigma \circ \pi$, where π is the restriction of ρ to symbols other than the c_ι (with additional entries $\pi(\mathsf{c}_\iota) = \{1, 2\}$) and σ maps c_ι to $\rho(\mathsf{c}_\iota)$ and other f_π to $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ if $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$. Then, if the processor is applicable with argument filtering ρ and reduction pair $(\succsim, \succ)$, it is also applicable with argument filtering π and the reduction pair given by: $s \succsim t$ if $\sigma(s) \succsim \sigma(t)$ and $s \succ t$ if $\sigma(s) \succ \sigma(t)$.

Now let us prove the theorem. Suppose $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ is not finite, so there is an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i, r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$. If $f = \mathsf{m}$ then, using Lemma 35, we find $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ such that always $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i), \overline{\pi}(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is an infinite chain, where each $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(U)} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}$, for $U := UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ (because $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{C}_\epsilon) = \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$). Alternatively, if $f = \mathsf{a}$, then by Lemma 30 the original chain gives rise to a filtered chain $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i), \overline{\pi}(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ where $\delta_i = \gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$ and each $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(U)} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}$ for $U := \mathcal{R}$.

Using Lemma 16, we can alter this chain to a sequence $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i), \overline{\pi}(r_i), \epsilon_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ which uses the same dependency pairs, and where $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\epsilon_i \to^*_{FR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(U))} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\epsilon_{i+1}$. If a reduction pair as described exists, then this chain cannot use the filtered pairs from $\mathcal{P}^\succ$ infinitely often; thus, the original chain must also have a tail with all dependency pairs in $\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ$. □

Proof (Proof of Lemma 25). The original reduction $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ gives rise to a formative reduction over $A_{\mathcal{R}}$: all non-collapsing rules of $\mathcal{R}$ are in NC, and all collapsing rules are obtained as a concatenation of steps in Cl (because the input of the lemma is an MTRS, so $Var(r) \subseteq Var(\ell)$ for all $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$).

So, we assume given a formative ℓ-reduction over $A_{\mathcal{R}}$, and prove with induction first on the number of non-collapsing steps in the reduction, second on the length of the reduction, third on the size of s, that $s \to^*_{SR(\ell,A_{\mathcal{R}})} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction. If $s = l\gamma$ we are done immediately. If the reduction uses no steps at the root, we are quickly done with the third induction hypothesis and the fact that if $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ each $SR(l_i, A_{\mathcal{R}}) \subseteq SR(\ell, A_{\mathcal{R}})$. Thus, let us assume the reduction has the form $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell'\delta \to_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} r'\delta = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)\gamma = \ell\gamma$ where $\ell' \to r' \in A_{\mathcal{R}}$, with each $t_i \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction.

If $\ell' \to r' \in NC$ we are done immediately: then r' has the form $f(\ldots)$, so $\ell' \to r' \in SR(\ell, \mathcal{R})$, and we quickly complete with the first induction hypothesis.

Thus, let us assume that the reduction has the form $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1 \to_{Cl} x_{i_1}\delta_1 = g_2(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_2 \to_{Cl} x_{i_2}\delta_2 = \ldots \to_{Cl} x_{i_k}\delta_k = r'\delta \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} l\gamma$; we know this for $k = 1$, but allow greater k for more convenient inductive reasoning. We assume k is chosen as high as possible, so the reduction $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1$ does not end with a collapsing step at the root.

Now, suppose $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} g_1(\boldsymbol{x})$ uses no steps at the root, so $s = g_1(s_1, \ldots, s_{n_1})$ and each $s_i \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} x_i\delta_1$ by a formative x_i-reduction. Since each x_i is a variable, these reductions are empty: $s = g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1 \to^*_{Cl} r'\delta$, and as $r'\delta \to^*_{SR(\ell,A_{\mathcal{R}})} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, we are done (all collapsing rules are formative).

Alternatively, suppose the reduction has the form $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell''\chi \to_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} r''\chi \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1$, with the (formative) reduction $r''\chi \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1$ not using any topmost steps. Then as in the previous case, we know that $r''\chi = g_1(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_1$. We cannot have $\ell'' \to r'' \in Cl$, by the assumption that k is maximal. Thus, $r'' = g_1(r_1, \ldots, r_{n_1})$ and we have $\ell'' \to r'' \in NC$; we also have $g_1(\boldsymbol{x}) \to x_{i_1} \in Cl$. Therefore, X (the set constructed in Definition 22) also contains the rule $\ell'' \to r_{i_1}$.

There are two options. If r_{i_1} is not a variable, then $\ell'' \to r_{i_1} \in NC$. Thus, we can alter the reduction to have the form $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell''\chi \to_{NC} g_2(\boldsymbol{x})\delta_2 \to^*_{Cl} r\delta \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell\gamma$. This reduction, which is still a formative ℓ-reduction, has as many non-collapsing steps as the original, but one less collapsing step, so we complete with the second induction hypothesis.

Alternatively, if r_{i_1} is a variable, then $\ell'' \to^*_{Cl} r_{i_1}$, so we can transform the reduction into the formative reduction $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell''\chi \to^*_{Cl} r\delta \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell\gamma$, which uses fewer non-collapsing rules. We complete with the first induction hypothesis. □

Proof (Proof of Theorem 26). As in Theorem 19, it suffices if a $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain can be transformed into a $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), SR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), A_{\overline{\pi}(U)}))$-chain which uses the same dependency pairs infinitely often. That is, given a $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$, there are $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ where that each $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^*_{SR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),A_{\overline{\pi}(U)}))} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}$.

To this end, we use either Lemma 35 or Lemma 30 to find $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \ldots$ which give the $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(U))$-chain $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i) \to \overline{\pi}(r_i), \epsilon_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$. Lemma 16 gives us δ_1, δ_2 such that $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i) \to \overline{\pi}(r_i), \delta_i)]$ is a *formative* $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(U))$-chain. Since, by Lemma 25, also $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^*_{SR(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),A_{\overline{\pi}(U)})} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}$, we are done. □

B Formative Rules with *TCap*

The definition of usable rules presented in Definition 5 is an early definition, which is convenient for presentation, but it is not the most powerful definition of usable rules in existence. Later definitions use the function *TCap* [8, Definition 11]:

Definition 36 (*TCap*). *Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a TRS (an MTRS), let t be a term. Then $TCap(s, \mathcal{R}) = f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ if $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and moreover $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ does not unify with any left-hand side of a rule from $\mathcal{R}$; otherwise $TCap(s, \mathcal{R})$ is a different fresh variable for every occurrence of s.*

This definition is used as follows for usable rules [8, Definition 15]:

Definition 37 (Usable Rules with *TCap*). *Let t be a term, $\mathcal{R}$ a set of rules and π an argument filtering. $UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ is the smallest set $\subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that:*

- *if $\mathcal{R}$ is not finitely branching, then $UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \mathcal{R}$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$, then:*
  - *$UR_T(t_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ for all $i \in \pi(f)$;*
  - *any rule $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ is in $UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ if $f(TCap(t_1), \ldots, TCap(t_n))$ unifies with ℓ;*
- *if $\ell \to r \in UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, then $UR_T(r, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$, we define $UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} UR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

In all the results in this paper, we could use UR_T exactly like UR, as Lemma 35 goes through with this alternative definition (which we will see in Appendix C).

Similar to usable rules, we can also use *TCap* in the definition of formative rules. This gives a new formative rules approximation, which is more powerful than the default "compare root symbol" version FR_{base} (which, however, is more suitable for presentation).

Definition 38 (Formative Rules with *TCap*). *Let t be a term and $\mathcal{R}$ a set of rules. $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$ is the smallest set $\subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that:*

- *if t is not linear, then $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ then:*
  - *$FR_T(t_i, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$ for all i;*
  - *if $t : \iota$ then $\ell \to x \in FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$ for all collapsing rules $\ell \to x : \iota \in \mathcal{R}$;*
  - *any rule $\ell \to f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ is in $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$ if $f(TCap(r_1), \ldots, TCap(r_n))$ unifies with t;*
- *if $\ell \to r \in FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$, then $FR_T(\ell, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_T(t, \mathcal{R})$.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$, we define $FR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR_T(s, \mathcal{R})$.

Of course, we need to prove that also FR_T defines a formative rules approximation. To this end, we first observe that *TCap* has various nice properties, as listed in the following lemma:

Lemma 39 (*TCap* properties).

1. *For every s there is some γ on domain $Var(TCap(s))$ such that $s = TCap(s)\gamma$.*
2. *If $t = TCap(s)\gamma$, then there is some substitution δ with $TCap(t) = TCap(s)\delta$.*
3. *If $TCap(s)\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$, then we can write $t = TCap(s)\delta$ for some substitution δ.*

Proof. Each of these statements follows easily with induction on the size of s.

(1): If $TCap(s)$ is a variable, then let $\gamma = [TCap(s) := s]$. Otherwise, $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $TCap(s) = f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ and there are $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ such that each $s_i = TCap(s_i)\gamma_i$. Since by definition of $TCap$ the variables in all $TCap(s_i)$ are disjoint, we can safely define $\gamma := \gamma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \gamma_n$.

(2): If $TCap(s)$ is a variable, then we let $\delta = [TCap(s) := TCap(t)]$. Otherwise, $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $TCap(s) = f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$. Thus we can write $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ with each $t_i = TCap(s_i)\gamma$. By the induction hypothesis, and using again the uniqueness of variables in $TCap(s)$, we thus have $TCap(t_i) = TCap(s_i)\delta$ for some δ. If $TCap(t) = f(TCap(t_1), \ldots, TCap(t_n))$ we are therefore done. Otherwise, we must have that $f(TCap(\boldsymbol{t}))\epsilon = \ell\eta$ for some left-hand side ℓ of $\mathcal{R}$ and substitutions ϵ, η. But then also $f(TCap(\boldsymbol{s}))$ unifies with ℓ, contradiction with $TCap(s)$ not being a variable!

(3): If $TCap(s)$ is a variable, then let $\delta = [TCap(s) := t]$. Otherwise, we have $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $TCap(s) = f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ does not unify with any left-hand side. Thus, the reduction cannot occur at the root; we can write $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_i, \ldots, t_n)$ with $TCap(s_i)\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_i$ and $TCap(s_j)\gamma = t_j$ for $j \neq i$. Let each δ_j be the restriction of γ to variables in $TCap(s_j)$, and let δ_i be given by the induction hypothesis, so $t_i = TCap(s_i)\delta_i$. Then $t = TCap(s)\delta$. □

With these preparations, we can easily obtain the required result:

Theorem 40. *If $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, then this reduction uses only rules in $FR_T(\ell, \mathcal{R})$. Thus, FR_T is a formative rules approximation.*

Proof. By induction on the definition of a formative reduction.

If ℓ is non-linear, then $FR_T(\ell, \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{R}$, so this is obvious.

If $s = \ell\gamma$ then the rules do not play a part.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and each $s_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction, then by the induction hypothesis these reductions only use rules in $FR_T(l_i, \mathcal{R})$. Since $FR_T(l_i, \mathcal{R}) \subseteq FR_T(l, \mathcal{R})$, we have the desired result.

If $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell'\delta \to_{\mathcal{R}} r'\delta = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)\gamma = \ell\gamma$, then by the same reasoning the reduction $r'\delta \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ uses only formative rules of ℓ, and by the induction hypothesis the reduction $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell'\delta$ uses only formative rules of ℓ'. We are done if $\ell' \to r'$ is a formative rule of ℓ.

This is obvious if r' is a variable, since it necessarily has the same sort as ℓ (sorts are preserved under substitution). If not a variable, so $r' = f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$, then note that by Lemma 39, (1) $r_i\delta = TCap(r_i)\delta'$ for some δ', and (2) since $TCap(r_i)\delta' \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} l_i\gamma$ we can write $l_i\gamma = TCap(r_i)\epsilon$ for some substitution ϵ. Thus, l_i is unifiable with $TCap(r_i)$. By linearity of ℓ, and since the variables in $TCap$ are all chosen fresh, this means ℓ is unifiable with $f(TCap(r_1), \ldots, TCap(r_n))$. □

In the next section, we will also introduce *SR* with *TCap*.

C Usable and Formative Rules with respect to an Argument Filtering

As observed in the text, the way argument filterings are used with formative rules differs from the way they are used with usable rules. Essentially: in usable rules we use $\overline{\pi}(\mathit{UR}(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))$ whereas in formative rules we use $\mathit{FR}(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$.

Now, we could easily have defined $\mathit{FR}_{\mathsf{base}}$ in exactly the same way as UR, taking the argument filtering into account. The reason we did not do so is twofold:

- the *semantic* definition of formative rules with respect to an argument filtering is somewhat more complicated;
- $\mathit{FR}(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})) \subseteq \overline{\pi}(\mathit{FR}_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))$ when defined in the obvious way.

However, this result does not hold when using FR_T instead of $\mathit{FR}_{\mathsf{base}}$. When determining $\mathit{FR}_T(f(l_1,\ldots,l_n),\mathcal{R},\pi)$ we check whether, for rules $\ell \to f(r_1,\ldots,r_n)$, each $\mathit{TCap}(r_i)$ unifies with l_i; also for $i \notin \pi(f)$!

Therefore, let us now introduce a semantic definition of formative rules with respect to an argument filtering, and show how it can be used!

C.1 Semantic Formative Rules with an Argument Filtering

Before being able to give the desired semantic definition, we will need some additional terminology.

Definition 41. *A reduction step $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$ occurs at a* regarded position *of s for an argument filtering π if:*[10]

- $s = \ell\gamma$ *and* $t = r\gamma$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ *and some substitution* γ, or
- $s = f(s_1,\ldots,s_i,\ldots,s_n)$, $t = f(s_1,\ldots,s'_i,\ldots,s_n)$ *and* $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} s'_i$ *and* $i \in \pi(f)$

As might be expected, regarded positions find their use in filtering:

Lemma 42. *If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$ occurs at a regarded position for π, then $\overline{\pi}(s) \to_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} \overline{\pi}(t)$.*

Proof. By induction on Definition 41. If $s = \ell\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}} r\gamma = t$ for some $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$, then $\overline{\pi}(s) = \overline{\pi}(\ell)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}}$ by Lemma 29, $\to_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} \overline{\pi}(r)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}} = \overline{\pi}(r\gamma)$.

Otherwise, $s = f(\ldots,s_j,\ldots)$ and $t = f(\ldots,s'_j,\ldots)$ and $s_j \to_{\mathcal{R}} s'_j$ and $\pi(f) = \{i_1,\ldots,i_k\}$ and $j = i_l$ for some l; we have $\overline{\pi}(s) = f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}),\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s_{i_l}),\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))$ $\to_{\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})} f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}),\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s'_{i_l}),\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))$ by the induction hypothesis, $= \overline{\pi}(t)$. □

Lemma 43. *If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$ does not occur at a regarded position for π, then $\overline{\pi}(s) = \overline{\pi}(t)$.*

Proof. By induction on the definition of reduction. The reduction cannot take place at the root, as this is a regarded position. Thus, $s = f(\ldots,s_i,\ldots)$ and $t = f(\ldots,s'_i,\ldots)$ with $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} s'_i$. If $i \in \pi(f)$, then the reduction $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} s'_i$ does not occur at a regarded position; hence by the induction hypothesis $\overline{\pi}(s_i) = \overline{\pi}(s'_i)$, and therefore $\overline{\pi}(s) = f_\pi(\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s_i),\ldots) = f_\pi(\ldots,\overline{\pi}(s'_i),\ldots) = \overline{\pi}(t)$. Otherwise we directly see that $\overline{\pi}(s) = \overline{\pi}(t)$, as the argument where they differ is filtered away. □

[10] Giesl et al. give a similar definition of regarded positions in [9].

Definition 44 (Formative Rules with respect to an Argument Filtering). *A function FR that maps a term ℓ, a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$ and an argument filtering π to a set $FR(\ell, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ is a formative rules approximation if for all s and γ: if $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ by a formative ℓ-reduction, then this reduction uses only rules in $FR(\ell, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ at regarded positions for π.*

Given an approximation FR, we define: $FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

To use this extended definition, we have the following result:

Lemma 45. *Let FR be a formative rules approximation. Given a formative $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ and an argument filtering π, each $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\gamma_i^{\overline{\pi}} \to^*_F \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\gamma_{i+1}^{\overline{\pi}}$, where $F = \overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$.*

Proof. Combining Lemmas 42 and 43: if in a reduction $s_1 \to_{\{\ell_1 \to r_1\}} s_2 \to_{\{\ell_2 \to r_2\}} \dots \to_{\{\ell_{n-1} \to r_{n-1}\}} s_n$ only steps with rules in $T \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ occur at regarded positions, then $\overline{\pi}(s_1) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(T)} \overline{\pi}(s_n)$. Thus, by definition of a formative rules approximation and Lemma 29, always $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}} = \overline{\pi}(r_i\gamma) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))} \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}) = \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\gamma_{i+1}^{\overline{\pi}}$. □

These results culminate in the following alternative to Theorem 19:

Theorem 46. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *if:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$*;*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in FR(\mathcal{P}, U, \pi)$ *where* $U = \mathcal{R}$ *if* $f = \mathsf{a}$ *and* $U = UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi_{\mathcal{T}}) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ *if* $f = \mathsf{m}$*;*
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof. Given an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain, we either keep it as it is (if $f = \mathsf{a}$) or use Lemma 35 *with an empty filtering* to turn it into a $(\mathcal{P}, U)$-chain (if $f = \mathsf{m}$). Using Lemma 16 we can turn this chain formative, and then use Lemma 45 to obtain an infinite decreasing $\succsim$-chain, which contradicts well-foundedness of $\succ$ unless the elements of $\mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ only occur finitely often. □

C.2 Syntactic Formative Rules with an Argument Filtering

We can easily extend the definition of FR_{base} to take into account the argument filtering directly:

Definition 47. *Let t be a term, $\mathcal{R}$ a set of rules and π an argument filtering. $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ is the smallest set $\subseteq \mathcal{R}$ such that:*

- *if t is not linear, then $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \mathcal{R}$;*
- *if $t = f(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, then:*
  - *$FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ for all i $\boxed{\in \pi(f)}$;*
  - *$\{\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R} \mid r$ has shape $f\} \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$;*

– *if* $\ell \to r \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$*, then* $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

For rules $\mathcal{P}$*, let* $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

Compared to Definition 7, the only difference (apart from the additional argument π) is that we added "$\in \pi(f)$" in the second condition, as highlighted; thus, $FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = FR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi_{\mathcal{T}})$. We will see that this is still a formative rules approximation as a consequence of Theorem 50; but first we must substantiate the claim we made before, that this definition does not really add anything compared to the definition in the text.

Lemma 48. *For all* $\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi$*:* $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})) \subseteq \overline{\pi}(FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$.

Proof. It suffices if for all terms s we have: if $t \to q \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$, then there is $u \to v \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ such that $t = \overline{\pi}(u)$ and $q = \overline{\pi}(v)$. This we prove by induction on the definition of $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$.

First, note that if s is not linear, then $\overline{\pi}(FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) = \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})$, so the requirement is definitely satisfied. So let us henceforth assume that s is linear. Since filtering does not duplicate variables, also $\overline{\pi}(s)$ is linear.

If s is a variable, then also $\overline{\pi}(s)$ is; thus, $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})) = \emptyset = \overline{\pi}(FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$. Therefore, let us assume that s has the form $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$. Let $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, so $\overline{\pi}(s) = f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k}))$. If $t \to q \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$, this is for one of the following reasons:

– $t \to q \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s_i), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$ for some $i \in \pi(f)$; by the induction hypothesis we can find suitable u, v such that $u \to v \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.
– q has shape f_π; since $FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s), \overline{\pi}(t)) \subseteq \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R})$, we can find u, v such that $t = \overline{\pi}(u)$ and $q = \overline{\pi}(v)$. Now, if q is a variable, then so is v; if q has root symbol f_π, then v has root symbol f. Either way, v has shape f, so $u \to v \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.
– $t \to q \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(t', \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$ for some $t' \to q' \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\overline{\pi}(s), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$. By the induction hypothesis, we can write $t' = \overline{\pi}(\ell)$ and $q' = \overline{\pi}(r)$ for some $\ell \to r \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$., and suitable u, v exist such that $u \to v \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(\ell, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$. Then also $u \to v \in FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

□

Thus, we indeed do not lose out by using FR_{base} directly on filtered terms rather than using the extended definition which takes the argument filtering π into account. However, it *does* make a relevant difference for the extended definition of FR_T:

Definition 49 (Formative Rules with *TCap* and an Argument Filtering). *Let* t *be a term,* $\mathcal{R}$ *a set of rules and* π *an argument filtering.* $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ *is the smallest set* $\subseteq \mathcal{R}$ *such that:*

– *if* t *is not linear, then* $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) = \mathcal{R}$*;*
– *if* $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ *then:*
  • $FR_T(t_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ *for all* i highlighted*;*

  - *if* $t : \iota$ *then* $\ell \to x \in FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ *for all collapsing rules* $\ell \to x : \iota \in \mathcal{R}$*;*
  - *any rule* $\ell \to f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ *is in* $FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ *if* $f(TCap(r_1), \ldots, TCap(r_n))$ *unifies with* t*;*
- *if* $\ell \to r \in FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$*, then* $FR_T(\ell, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$*.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$*, we define* $FR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}.\pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$*.*

Note that for regarded positions in $FR_T(f(t_1, \ldots, t_n), \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ and rules $\ell \to f(\boldsymbol{r})$ we must check that $f(TCap(r_1), \ldots, TCap(r_n))$ unifies with t, so that each $TCap(r_i)$ unifies with t_i. This is *not* limited to $i \in \pi(f)$, as it would be if we considered $FR_T(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$.

Theorem 50. *If* $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ *by a formative* ℓ*-reduction, then this reduction uses only rules in* $FR_T(\ell, \mathcal{R})$ *at regarded positions. Thus,* FR_T *is a formative rules approximation.*

Proof. We follow exactly the proof of Theorem 40. The only point where we have to differ is the case where $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $\ell = f(l_1, \ldots, l_n)$ and each $s_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} l_i\gamma$ by a formative l_i-reduction. Here we only need to observe that for sub-reductions with $i \in \pi(f)$ only rules in $FR(l_i, \mathcal{P}, \pi) \subseteq FR(\ell, \mathcal{P}, \pi)$ are used at regarded positions; the reductions in s_i with $i \notin \pi(f)$ are not regarded anyway!

Note that since obviously $FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_{\mathsf{base}}(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, also FR_{base} is a formative rules approximation. Consequently, both can be used in Theorem 46.

Finally, we can also add the implicit filtering to SR, along with $TCap$:

Definition 51 (Split-Formative Rules with $TCap$ and an Argument Filtering). *Let* t *be a term,* $\mathcal{R}$ *a set of rules and* π *an argument filtering.* $SR_T(t, A, \pi)$ *is the smallest set* $\subseteq A$ *such that:*

- *if* t *is not linear, then* $SR_T(t, A, \pi) = A$*;*
- *all collapsing rules in* A *are included in* $SR_T(t, A, \pi)$*;*
- *if* $t = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$*, then:*
  - $SR_T(t_i, A, \pi) \subseteq SR_T(t, A, \pi)$ *for all* $i \in \pi(f)$*;*
  - *any rule* $\ell \to f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ *where* $f(TCap(r_1), \ldots, TCap(r_n))$ *unifies with* t *is in* $SR_T(t, A, \pi)$*;*
- *if* $\ell \to r \in SR_T(t, A, \pi)$ *and* r *is not a variable, then* $SR_T(\ell, A, \pi) \subseteq SR_T(t, A, \pi)$*.*

For a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$*, we define* $SR_T(\mathcal{P}, A, \pi) = \bigcup_{s \to t \in \mathcal{P}} SR_T(s, A, \pi)$*.*

Lemma 52. *Given a set of rules* $\mathcal{R}$ *which satisfies the variable condition (i.e.* $Var(r) \subseteq Var(\ell)$ *for all* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$*), if* $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ *by a formative* ℓ*-reduction, then* $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell\gamma$ *by a formative* ℓ*-reduction, which only uses the rules of* $SR_T(\ell, A_{\mathcal{R}}, \pi)$ *on regarded positions.*

Proof. Following the proof of Lemma 25, the reduction $s \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell\gamma$ is turned into a formative reduction $s \to^*_{A_{\mathcal{R}}} \ell\gamma$ with the following property: a non-collapsing step at any given position is never followed by a collapsing step at the same position.

Using induction on the definition of a formative chain, using that the chain has this property, the lemma follows easily. □

Theorem 53. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *if:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^{\succ}$*;*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in SR_T(\mathcal{P}, A_U, \pi)$*,*
    where $U = \mathcal{R}$ *if* $f = \mathsf{a}$ *and* $U = UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi_{\mathcal{T}}) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ *if* $f = \mathsf{m}$*;*
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof. Let an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ be given. If $f = \mathsf{m}$ then let for all i the substitution $\delta_i := \gamma_i$. Otherwise let δ_i be given by Lemma 35, with $\pi_{\mathcal{T}}$ as the argument filtering; the proof to this lemma is easily adapted for UR_T (we do not present the adaptation here, although an extended version of the proof, with a different kind of filtering, is given in Appendix C.4).

Either way, we obtain an infinite $(\mathcal{P}, U)$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$. Using Lemma 16, we can turn this into a formative $(\mathcal{P}, U)$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \epsilon_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$.

By Lemma 52, each reduction $r_i\epsilon_i \to_U^* \ell_{i+1}\epsilon_{i+1}$ can be altered to use only rules in $SR_T(\ell, A_{\mathcal{R}}, \pi)$ on regarded positions. Consequently, the filtered chain $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i) \to \overline{\pi}(r_i), \epsilon_i^{\overline{\pi}}) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ uses only rules in $\overline{\pi}(SR_T(\mathcal{P}, A_{\mathcal{R}}, \pi))$. The requirements on $(\succsim, \succ)$ guarantee that a tail of this chain uses no dependency pairs in $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}^{\succ})$! □

C.3 *TCap*-Conscious Filtering

Unfortunately, when using Theorem 46, we do lose out in some ways compared to Theorem 19: rather than limiting rules to those in $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, we consider $UR(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$. The problem is that the proof of Theorems 19 and 46 both rely on transforming the input chain to use only rules in U. And unfortunately, Lemma 35 only gives a transformation to a *filtered* chain.

Towards countering this objection, we will define an alternative way to "filter" terms: $\overline{\pi}_\top$. In Appendix C.4 we will see how to use this alternative filtering to update the proof for usable rules, and obtain the desired processor (which is also the one we use for implementation).

Definition 54. *Fixing a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, we introduce for any sort ι the fresh symbol $\top_\iota : \iota$, and let for all terms s the term* $\mathsf{addtop}(s)$ *be $TCap(s)$ with all variables $x : \iota$ replaced by $\top_\iota$. Additionally, let $\mathcal{R}_\top$ be a set of rules containing, for all sorts ι, a rule $\top_\iota \to x$ with x a variable.*

Obviously, $\mathcal{R}_\top$ is non-terminating. But it does have certain desirable qualities.

Lemma 55. *For any term $s : \iota$ we have: $\top_\iota \to_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s$.*

Proof. Obvious (x can be instantiated with anything). □

Lemma 56. *For any term s and substitutions γ and δ, we have:* $\mathsf{addtop}(s)\gamma \to_{\mathcal{R}_\top}^* \mathsf{addtop}(s\delta)$.

Proof. Let $s : \iota$; we use induction on the size of s.

If $TCap(s)$ is a variable, then $\mathsf{addtop}(s)\gamma = \top_\iota\gamma = \top_\iota$. By Lemma 55 this reduces in one step to $\mathsf{addtop}(s\delta)$.

Otherwise, we can write $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ where $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ does not unify with any left-hand side of a rule in $\mathcal{R}$. Thus, $\mathsf{addtop}(s)\gamma = f(\mathsf{addtop}(s_1)\gamma, \ldots, \mathsf{addtop}(s_n)\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} f(\mathsf{addtop}(s_1\delta), \ldots, \mathsf{addtop}(s_n\delta))$ by the induction hypothesis. We are done if this is exactly $\mathsf{addtop}(f(s_1\delta, \ldots, s_n\delta))$, which is the case if $f(TCap(s_1\delta), \ldots, TCap(s_n\delta))$ also does not unify with any left-hand side. But by nature of $TCap$, this term can be expressed as an instance of $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$, so clearly cannot be unified with anything $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ cannot be unified with! □

Lemma 57. *For any term s:* $\mathsf{addtop}(s) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s$.

Proof. Observe that we can write $s = TCap(s)\delta$ for some substitution δ by Lemma 39, and $\mathsf{addtop}(s)$ can be written as $TCap(s)\epsilon$, where ϵ is the substitution mapping all variables in s to the corresponding $\top_\iota$ symbol. Since always $\epsilon(x) \to_{\mathcal{R}_\top} t$ for any t, and in particular for $t = \delta(x)$, we have $\mathsf{addtop}(s) = TCap(s)\epsilon \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} TCap(s)\delta = s$. □

Lemma 58. *If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$ then* $\mathsf{addtop}(s) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathsf{addtop}(t)$.

Proof. By Lemma 39(3), $TCap(t) = TCap(s)\gamma$ for some γ. Writing $\delta_\top$ for the substitution that maps each $x : \iota$ in $TCap(s)$ to $\top_\iota$, and $\epsilon_\top$ for the substitution that does the same for $TCap(t)$, note that by Lemma 55, each $\delta_\top(x) \to_{\mathcal{R}} \gamma(x)\epsilon_\top$. Hence we have: $\mathsf{addtop}(s) = TCap(s)\delta_\top \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} TCap(s)\gamma\epsilon_\top = \mathsf{addtop}(t)$. □

Using addtop, we can define an alternative way to"filter" a term.

Definition 59. *Given an argument filtering π, the function $\overline{\pi}_\top$ is given by:*

- $\overline{\pi}_\top(x) = x$ *for x a variable*
- $\overline{\pi}_\top(f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$*, where each $s'_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $s'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i)$ otherwise.*

For a rule $\ell \to r$, let $\overline{\pi}_\top(\ell \to r)$ be defined as $\ell \to \overline{\pi}_\top(r)$ (so with the left-hand side not *filtered!). For a set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, let $\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}) = \{\overline{\pi}_\top(\rho) \mid \rho \in \mathcal{R}\}$.*

The normal filtering can be concatenated to $\overline{\pi}_\top$:

Lemma 60. *For all terms s: $\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(s)) = \overline{\pi}(s)$.*

Proof. By induction on the definition of s. For a variable it is obvious. For $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ with $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, we have $\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(s)) = \overline{\pi}(f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n))$ with $s'_j = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_j)$ if $j \in \pi(f)$. This is equal to $f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(s_{i_1})), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(s_{i_k})))$, which by the induction hypothesis is exactly $f_\pi(\overline{\pi}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \overline{\pi}(s_{i_k})) = \overline{\pi}(s)$. □

For a corresponding result to the standard $\overline{\pi}(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}} = \overline{\pi}(s\gamma)$, we will use the following two lemmas:

Lemma 61. *For all terms s and substitutions γ on a domain containing $Var(s)$: $\overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$.*

Proof. By induction on the form of s.

If s is a variable, then $\overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma)\overline{\pi}_\top(\gamma(s)) = \gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}(s) = s\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$.

Otherwise, $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $\overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma) = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where $t_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i\gamma)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $t_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma)$ otherwise.

By the induction hypothesis, for $i \in \pi(f)$ we have $t_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s_i\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$. For $i \notin \pi(f)$ we have $t_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s_i\gamma$ by Lemma 57

Consequently, each $t_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s_i\gamma$, so $\overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma) = f(\boldsymbol{t}) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} f(\boldsymbol{s})\gamma = s\gamma$. □

Lemma 62. *For all terms s and substitutions γ whose domain contains $Var(s)$: $\overline{\pi}_\top(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma)$.*

Proof. By induction on the form of s.

If s is a variable, then $\overline{\pi}_\top(s)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top} = \gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}(s) = \overline{\pi}_\top(\gamma(s)) = \overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma)$.

Otherwise, $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ and $\overline{\pi}_\top(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ with $s'_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i)$ for $i \in \pi(f)$ and $s'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i)$ otherwise. Moreover, $\overline{\pi}_\top(s\gamma) = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ where $t_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i\gamma)$ for $i \in \pi(f)$ and $t_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma)$ otherwise. By the induction hypothesis, for $i \in \pi(f)$ we have $s'_i\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} t_i$. By Lemma 56 the same holds for $i \notin \pi(f)$. □

With this, we can see that "filtered" terms can be reduced with "filtered" rules, just like we could do in full filtering (except that sometimes $\mathcal{R}_\top$ rules are needed to fill in the gaps):

Lemma 63. *If $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$, then $\overline{\pi}_\top(s) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \overline{\pi}_\top(t)$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$.

If this is done by a top reduction, so $s = \ell\gamma$ and $t = r\gamma$ for some $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{R}$ and substitution γ, then $\overline{\pi}_\top(s) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \ell\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$ by Lemma 61. This term reduces by $\to_{\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R})}$ to $\overline{\pi}_\top(r)\gamma^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$. By Lemma 62, this reduces by $\to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top}$ to $\overline{\pi}_\top(r\gamma) = \overline{\pi}_\top(t)$.

Otherwise, we can write $s = f(\ldots, s_i, \ldots)$ and $t = f(\ldots, t_i, \ldots)$ with $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_i$. If $i \notin \pi(f)$ then observe that $\mathsf{addtop}(s_i) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathsf{addtop}(t_i)$ by Lemma 58. Otherwise $\overline{\pi}(s_i) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}) \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \overline{\pi}(t_i)$ by the induction hypothesis. Either way we are done. □

The important result, to use FR_T with "filtered" rules, is the following:

Lemma 64. *For all $s, \mathcal{R}, \pi$: $FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi) \subseteq \overline{\pi}_\top(FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$.*

Proof. We prove: if $\ell \to r \in FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$, then some r' exists such that $r = \overline{\pi}_\top(r')$ and $\ell \to r' \in FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ (so therefore $\overline{\pi}_\top(\ell \to r') = \ell \to r \in \overline{\pi}_\top(FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$).

Obviously, linearity is the same in both cases, so if $FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi) = \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R})$ by linearity, the same holds for $\overline{\pi}_\top(FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$. Otherwise, let s be linear, and assume that $\ell \to r \in FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$. Since $FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$ is non-empty, s cannot be a variable; we can write $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$.

First, suppose $\ell \to r \in FR_T(t, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$ for some $t \to q \in FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$. By the induction hypothesis, we can find suitable q' such that $t \to q' \in$

$FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, and $q = \overline{\pi}_\top(q')$, so applying again the induction hypothesis with $\ell \to r$ and t, we find suitable r' such that $\ell \to r' \in FR_T(t, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

Second, suppose $\ell \to r \in FR_T(s_i, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$ for some $i \in \pi(f)$. Then by the induction hypothesis, we can find suitable r' with $\ell \to r' \in FR_T(s_i, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \subseteq FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

Otherwise, note that since $\ell \to r \in \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R})$ we can always find r' such that $\overline{\pi}_\top(\ell \to r') = \ell \to r$. If $\ell \to r \in FR_T(s, \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{R}), \pi)$ because it is collapsing, then r' is a variable too, and therefore $\ell' \to r' \in FR_T(s, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$.

If not collapsing, $r' = f(r'_1, \ldots, r'_n)$ and $r = f(r_1, \ldots, r_n)$ where $r_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(r'_i)$ for $i \in \pi(f)$ but $r_i = \mathsf{addtop}(r'_i)$ and $i \notin \pi(f)$; also, $f(\mathit{TCap}(r_1), \ldots, \mathit{TCap}(r_n))$ unifies with s. This exactly means that each $\mathit{TCap}(r_i)$ unifies with s_i. We are done if also $\mathit{TCap}(r'_i)$ unifies with s_i.

For $i \notin \pi(f)$, this means: given that $\mathit{TCap}(\mathsf{addtop}(r'_i))$ unifies with s_i, we must see that also $\mathit{TCap}(r'_i)$ unifies with s_i. Observing that the $\top_\iota$ symbols obviously unify with a left-hand side in $\mathcal{R}_\top$, we have $\mathit{TCap}(\mathsf{addtop}(r'_i)) = \mathit{TCap}(r'_i)$, so this is obviously true.

For $i \in \pi(f)$, this means: given that $\mathit{TCap}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r'_i))$ unifies with s_i, we must see that also $\mathit{TCap}(r'_i)$ unifies with s_i. But with induction on the form of q we very easily see that $\mathit{TCap}(\overline{\pi}_\top(q)) = \mathit{TCap}(q)$ for all q, modulo renaming of variables. So this, too, is obvious. □

C.4 Usable Rules with an Argument Filtering: Alternative Way

As announced in Appendix C.3, we will now look at an alternative way to prove Theorem 6, which also uses the strengthened usable rules from Definition 37.

Theorem 65 (Extended version of Theorem 6). *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ, \mathcal{R}, \mathsf{m})\}$ *if* $f = \mathsf{m}$ *and:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P}^\succ$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succsim \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell \to r \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ$*;*
  - $\overline{\pi}(u) \succsim \overline{\pi}(v)$ *for* $u \to v \in \mathit{UR}_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$.
- $\{(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, f)\}$ *otherwise*

We prove this with a reasoning much like the one used in Appendix A. However, we will use $\overline{\pi}_\top$ instead of $\overline{\pi}$.

Definition 66. *Fixing a finitely branching set of rules $\mathcal{R}$, a set of rules $\mathcal{P}$ and an argument filtering π, we introduce for any sort ι additional fresh symbols $\bot_\iota : \iota$ and $\mathsf{c}_\iota : [\iota \times \iota] \Rightarrow \iota$. The function $\mathcal{I}$ from* terminating *terms to terms is inductively defined by:*

- *if s is a variable, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = s$;*
- *if s has the form $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, with $f(\boldsymbol{s}) : \iota$, then let for all $1 \leq k \leq n$: $s'_k = \mathcal{I}(s_k)$ if $k \in \pi(f)$ and $s'_k = \mathsf{addtop}(s_k)$ otherwise. We have:*
  - *if $f(\mathit{TCap}(s_1), \ldots, \mathit{TCap}(s_n))$ does not unify with any left-hand side of a rule from $\mathcal{R} \setminus \mathit{UR}_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$*

- *otherwise,* $\mathcal{I}(s) = \mathsf{c}_\iota(f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n), \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(\{t \mid f(\boldsymbol{s}) \to_\mathcal{R} t\}))$*, where* $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota$ *is defined by:*
  - $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(\emptyset) = \bot_\iota$
  - $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X) = \mathsf{c}_\iota(\mathcal{I}(t), \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X \setminus \{t\}))$ *if* X *is non-empty and* t *is its smallest element (lexicographically).*

This definition is well-defined because the system is finitely branching (so X is always finite) and terminating.

Let us start off with some technical lemmas about the relation between addtop and $\mathcal{I}$.

Lemma 67. *For all terms* s*:* $\mathsf{addtop}(s) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(s)$.

Proof. By induction on the form of s.

If $\mathsf{addtop}(s) = \top_\iota$ for some ι, then we are immediately done by Lemma 55. Otherwise, $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, with $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ not unifying with any left-hand side of $\mathcal{R}$. In particular, it does not unify with a left-hand side from $\mathcal{R} \setminus UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$. Therefore, $\mathcal{I}(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ where:

- for $i \in \pi(f)$: $s'_i = \mathcal{I}(s_i)$, so by the induction hypothesis $\mathsf{addtop}(s_i) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s'_i$;
- for $i \notin \pi(f)$: $s'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i)$, so $\mathsf{addtop}(s_i) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s'_i$ in 0 steps.

Thus, $\mathsf{addtop}(s) = f(\mathsf{addtop}(s_1), \ldots, \mathsf{addtop}(s_n)) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n) = \mathcal{I}(s)$. □

Lemma 68. *For all terms* s *and substitutions* γ*:* $\mathsf{addtop}(s\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} s\gamma^\mathcal{I}$.

Proof. By induction on the form of s.

If s is a variable, then $\mathsf{addtop}(s\gamma) = \mathsf{addtop}(\gamma(s)) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(\gamma(s)) = s\gamma^\mathcal{I}$ by Lemma 67.

Otherwise, let $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$. If $\mathsf{addtop}(s\gamma) = \top_\iota$ for some ι, then we are immediately done by Lemma 55. If not, then $\mathsf{addtop}(s\gamma) = f(\mathsf{addtop}(s_1\gamma), \ldots, \mathsf{addtop}(s_n\gamma)) \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} f(s_1\gamma^\mathcal{I}, \ldots, s_n\gamma^\mathcal{I}) = s\gamma^\mathcal{I}$ by the induction hypothesis. □

Furthermore, it will be useful to know what happens to the special $\top_\iota$ symbols, as we will eventually want to get rid of them again!

Lemma 69. *If* s *is terminating, and all its (direct and indirect) reducts do not contain any symbols* $\top_\iota$*, then* $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{I}(s))$ *also does not.*

Proof. By induction on s with $\to_\mathcal{R} \cup \rhd$, where $\rhd$ is the strict superterm relation (this union is well-founded because s is assumed terminating).

If s is a variable, then $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{I}(s)) = s$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, then either it does not unify with the left-hand side of some rule in $\mathcal{R} \setminus UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$ or it does.

In the first case, $\mathcal{I}(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ where $s'_i = \mathcal{I}(s_i)$ for $i \in \pi(f)$; writing $\pi(f) = \{i_1, \ldots, i_k\}$, we have $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{I}(s)) = f_\pi(s'_{i_1}, \ldots, s'_{i_k}) = f_\pi(\mathcal{I}(s_{i_1}), \ldots, \mathcal{I}(s_{i_k}))$, which by the induction hypothesis does not contain any $\top_\iota$-symbols.

In the second case, $\mathcal{I}(s) = \mathsf{c}(f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n), \mathsf{makelist}(X))$ where, as we saw before, $\overline{\pi}(f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n))$ does not contain any illegal symbols, and $\top_\iota$ can only occur in $\overline{\pi}(\mathsf{makelist}(X))$ if it occurs in some $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{I}(t))$ with $s \to_\mathcal{R} t$. By the induction hypothesis, this is not the case. □

Now, let us move on to lemmas corresponding to the results in Appendix A.2.

Lemma 70. *For all terms s and substitutions γ, we have: $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} s\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$.*

Proof. By induction on the size of s.

For a variable we easily see that $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = \mathcal{I}(\gamma(s)) = \gamma^{\mathcal{I}}(s) = s\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, then let for all $1 \leq i \leq n$: $t_i = \mathcal{I}(s_i\gamma)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $t_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma)$ otherwise. Then either $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = f(\boldsymbol{t})$, or $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) \to_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} f(\boldsymbol{t})$.

Now, for all i, we have $t_i \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} s_i\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$: if $i \in \pi(f)$ then this is provided by the induction hypothesis, otherwise it holds by Lemma 68. Thus, $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) \to^{=}_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} f(s'_1\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}, \ldots, s'_n\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}) = s\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$. □

To handle the updated definition of usable rules (with *TCap*), we must also redefine "completely π-usable":

Definition 71. *A term $f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ is* completely *TCap-π-*usable *if:*

- *$f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ does not unify with the left-hand side of any rule in $\mathcal{R} \setminus UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)$*
- *for all $i \in \pi(f)$ also s_i is completely TCap-π-usable.*

In addition, all variables are completely TCap-π-usable.

Lemma 72. *For all substitutions γ on domain $Var(s)$ and completely π-usable terms s: $\overline{\pi}_\top(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(s\gamma)$.*

Proof. By induction on the size of s.

For a variable we easily see that $\overline{\pi}_\top(s)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} = s\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} = \gamma^{\mathcal{I}}(s) = \mathcal{I}(\gamma(s)) = \mathcal{I}(s\gamma)$.

If $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$, then $\overline{\pi}_\top(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ where each $s'_i = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $s'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i)$ otherwise. On the other hand, since s is completely *TCap*-π-usable, we have $\mathcal{I}(s\gamma) = f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ with $t_i = \mathcal{I}(s_i\gamma)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $t_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma)$ otherwise. We are done if each $s'_i\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} t_i$.

For $i \in \pi(f)$, note that s_i is also completely *TCap*-π-usable, so we can use the induction hypothesis: $s'_i\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} = \overline{\pi}_\top(s_i)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(s_i\gamma) = t_i$. For other i, we need: $\mathsf{addtop}(s_i)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathsf{addtop}(s_i\gamma)$. This follows immediately with Lemma 55. □

Lemma 73. *If s is a terminating term and $\mathcal{R}$ finitely branching, and $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}_\top(UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(t)$.*

Proof. By induction on the derivation of $s \to_{\mathcal{R}} t$. Since s reduces, it is not a variable, so let $s = f(s_1, \ldots, s_n)$. For brevity, also denote $U := \overline{\pi}_\top(UR_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$.

If $f(TCap(s_1), \ldots, TCap(s_n))$ unifies with the left-hand side of some rule in $\mathcal{R} \setminus U$, then $\mathcal{I}(s) \to_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X)$, where X is a set which contains t. It is easy to see that therefore $\mathsf{makelist}_\iota(X) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon} \mathcal{I}(t)$. Thus, let us henceforth assume that $f(TCap(\boldsymbol{s}))$ does not unify with any left-hand sides of $\mathcal{R} \setminus U$. We can write $\mathcal{I}(s) = f(s'_1, \ldots, s'_n)$ with $s'_i = \mathcal{I}(s_i)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $s'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(s_i)$ otherwise.

First suppose the reduction is not at the root, so $t = f(s_1, \ldots, t_i, \ldots, s_n)$ with $s_i \to_{\mathcal{R}} t_i$. In this case, $TCap(t)$ is an instance of $TCap(s)$ by Lemma 39, so does not unify with anything $TCap(s)$ does not unify with. Thus, also $\mathcal{I}(t) =$

$f(s'_1, \ldots, t'_i, \ldots, s'_n)$ with $t'_i = \mathcal{I}(t_i)$ if $i \in \pi(f)$ and $t'_i = \mathsf{addtop}(t_i)$ otherwise. In the first case, the induction hypothesis provides that $s'_i \to^*_{U \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} t'_i$. In the second case, Lemma 58 gives that $s'_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} t'_i$.

Alternatively, if the reduction is at the root, then $s = \ell\gamma$ and $t = r\gamma$ for some rule $\ell \to r$ and substitution γ. Since $s = \mathit{TCap}(s)\delta$ for some δ by Lemma 39, obviously $\mathit{TCap}(s)$ unifies with ℓ, so $\ell \to r$ must be in U. Now we have: $\mathcal{I}(s) = \mathcal{I}(\ell\gamma) \to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \ell\gamma^{\mathcal{I}}$ by Lemma 70, $\to^*_{\overline{\pi}_\top(U)} \overline{\pi}_\top(r)\gamma^{\mathcal{I}} \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(r\gamma)$ by Lemma 72 because for a usable rule $\ell \to r$, indeed r is completely TCap-π-usable! □

Lemma 74. *If there is an infinite minimal $(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$, then there are $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ such that $[(\ell_i \to \overline{\pi}_\top(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is an infinite $(\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{P}), \overline{\pi}_\top(\mathit{UR}_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top)$-chain.*

In this chain, the symbols $\top_\iota$ occur only at filtered positions; that is, if the reduction for a given i has the form $\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\delta_i \to^* q \to^* \ell_{i+1}\delta_{i+1}$, then $\overline{\pi}(q)$ does not contain any symbol $\top_\iota$.

Proof. This is obvious if $\mathcal{R}$ is not finitely branching, taking $\delta_i = \gamma_i$ for all i and noting that the original chain is over a signature not containing any $\top_\iota, \bot_\iota$ or c_ι.

Otherwise, $\mathcal{I}$ is defined on terminating terms, such as all $r_i\gamma_i$ and their reducts. Thus, for all i, we define $\delta_i = \gamma_i^{\mathcal{I}}$. Then we have: $r_i\gamma \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell_{i+1}\gamma$ implies that $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(r_i\gamma_i)$ (by Lemma 72) $\to^*_{\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathit{UR}_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \mathcal{I}(\ell_i\gamma_{i+1})$ (by Lemma 73) $\to^*_{\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} \ell_i\delta_{i+1}$ (by Lemma 70).

Now we observe that since minimality gives termination of $\mathcal{R}$ on the $r_i\gamma$, that any rule which is used in the reduction $r_i\gamma_i \to^*_{\mathcal{R}} \ell_{i+1}\gamma_{i+1}$ satisfies the variable condition: the right-hand side of the rule contains no variables not occurring on the left. Limiting interest to only rules which actually occur in the original chain, we can therefore say that if $r_i\gamma_i$ does not contain $\top$-symbols (and we assume that the initial chain does not), then neither does any of its direct or indirect reducts.

Observing that $\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\gamma_i^{\mathcal{I}}) = \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i))\gamma_i^{\overline{\pi}\circ\mathcal{I}} = \overline{\pi}(r_i)\gamma_i^{\overline{\pi}\circ\mathcal{I}}$, and noting that that $\overline{\pi}(r_i)$ does not contain any $\top_\iota$ symbols because r_i does not, we also see that $\gamma_i^{\overline{\pi}\circ\mathcal{I}}$ (which maps variables to values $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{I}(\gamma(x)))$) does not contain any $\top$-symbols by Lemma 69, using the above observation that no reducts of $r_i\gamma_i$ (or any of its subterms) contains a $\top$-symbol.

Thus, the first element of the reduction $\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\gamma_i^{\mathcal{I}}$ contains the $\top$-symbols only at filtered positions. The lemma follows because this property is preserved by reduction: if q contains $\top_\iota$ only at filtered positions, and $q \to_{\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathit{UR}(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top} u$, then the same holds for u. This follows easily with induction on q (noting that the right-hand sides of rules in $\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathit{UR}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi))$ only contain $\top$-symbols at filtered positions, and using that the right-hand sides of rules do not introduce variables not occurring on the left). □

Proof (Proof of Theorem 65). Let $[(\ell_i \to r_i, \gamma_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ be an infinite minimal $(\mathcal{P} \setminus \mathcal{P}^\succ, \mathcal{R})$-chain. By Lemma 74, we can find $\delta_1, \delta_2, \ldots$ such that $[(\ell_i \to \overline{\pi}_\top(r_i), \delta_i) \mid i \in \mathbb{N}]$ is a chain. This new chain uses (filtered versions of) the same dependency pairs infinitely often, but uses $\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathit{UR}_T(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}, \pi)) \cup \mathcal{C}_\epsilon \cup \mathcal{R}_\top$ for the reduction $\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\delta_i \to^* \ell_{i+1}\delta_{i+1}$, and contains the $\mathcal{R}_\top$ symbols only at filtered positions.

Now observe that using the results in Appendix A.1, we can modify this chain

with full filterings. We have, for all i: $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\delta_i^{\overline{\pi}} = \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i))\delta_i^{\overline{\pi}}$ (by Lemma 60), $= \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\delta_i) \to^*_{\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon\cup\mathcal{R}_\top)} \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}) = \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\delta_{i+1}^{\overline{\pi}}$. Moreover, this reduction does not use the rules in $\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}_\top)$, as the $\top$-symbols occur only at filtered positions in the reduction, and thus are all filtered away.

Since $\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))) = \overline{\pi}(UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))$ and we can assume, as we did in the proof of Theorem 6, that π does not touch the c_ι symbols, the requirements guarantee that the new chain cannot use filtered elements of $\mathcal{P}^\succ$ infinitely often. Hence, the original chain must have a tail without these pairs. □

C.5 Usable and Formative Rules with *TCap* and an argument Filtering

And now, at last, do we have all the preparations for the result that FR_T and UR_T can be combined as you might hope, including argument filterings:

Theorem 75. *Let $(\succsim, \succ)$ be a reduction pair and π an argument filtering. The processor which maps a DP problem $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f)$ to the following result is sound:*

- $\{(\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}^\succ,\mathcal{R},f)\}$ *if:*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell) \succ \overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell\to r\in\mathcal{P}^\succ$ *and* $\overline{\pi}(\ell)\succsim\overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell\to r\in\mathcal{P}\setminus\mathcal{P}^\succ$*;*
  - $\overline{\pi}(\ell)\succsim\overline{\pi}(r)$ *for* $\ell\to r\in FR_T(\mathcal{P},U,\pi)$
    where $U=\mathcal{R}$ *if* $f=\mathsf{a}$ *and* $U=UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ *if* $f=\mathsf{m}$*;*
- $\{(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},f)\}$ *otherwise.*

Proof. Assume given an infinite $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})$-chain $[(\ell_i\to r_i,\gamma_i)\mid i\in\mathbb{N}]$.

If $f=\mathsf{a}$, then let, for all i, $\delta_i=\gamma_i^{\overline{\pi}_\top}$. Then by Lemmas 61–63, $[(\ell_i\to\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i),\delta_i)]$ is an infinite $(\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}_\top(U)\cup\mathcal{R}_\top)$-chain, where $U=\mathcal{R}$. Moreover, it is easy to see that since the $r_i\gamma_i$ do not contain any $\top_\iota$-symbols, all terms in this chain contain $\top_\iota$-symbols only at filtered positions.

On the other hand, if $f=\mathsf{m}$, then we may assume that all $r_i\gamma_i$ are terminating. By Lemma 74 there are $\delta_1,\delta_2,\ldots$ such that $[(\ell_i\to\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i),\delta_i)\mid i\in\mathbb{N}]$ is an infinite $(\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}_\top(U)\cup\mathcal{R}_\top)$-chain, where $U=UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$. Also in this chain, the $\top_\iota$-symbols occur only at filtered positions.

Now, using Lemma 16, we can turn this chain formative: there are substitutions $\epsilon_1,\epsilon_2,\ldots$ such that $[(\ell_i\to\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i),\epsilon_i)\mid i\in\mathbb{N}]$ is an infinite formative $(\overline{\pi}_\top(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}_\top(U)\cup\mathcal{R}_\top)$-chain. Considering the way this result is proved, no $\top_\iota$ symbols are introduced at unfiltered positions.

Since FR_T is a formative rules approximation, we see by Lemma 45 that each $\overline{\pi}(r_i)\epsilon_i^{\overline{\pi}} = \overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i))\epsilon_i^{\overline{\pi}} \to_F^* \overline{\pi}(\ell_{i+1})\epsilon_i^{\overline{\pi}}$, where $F=\overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P},\overline{\pi}_\top(U)\cup\mathcal{R}_\top,\pi))$. And what is more: since the original reduction $\overline{\pi}_\top(r_i)\epsilon_i$ only contains $\top_\iota$-symbols at filtered positions, this filtered reduction does not contain those symbols at all! Thus, the $\mathcal{R}_\top$ rules are never used. In addition, by Lemma 64, $\overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P},\overline{\pi}_\top(U),\pi))\subseteq\overline{\pi}(\overline{\pi}_\top(FR(\mathcal{P},U,\pi)))=\overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P},U,\pi))$. Thus, we obtain an infinite $(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(FR(\mathcal{P},U,\pi)))$-chain $[(\overline{\pi}(\ell_i)\to\overline{\pi}(r_i),\epsilon_i^{\overline{\pi}})\mid i\in\mathbb{N}]$.

Throughout these transformations, the dependency pairs (in filtered form) have stayed in the same place. Since the reduction pair proves that for $\ell\to r\in\mathcal{P}^\succ$ the pair $\overline{\pi}(\ell)\to\overline{\pi}(r)$ cannot occur infinitely often, we therefore also see that the original chain must have had a tail where pairs in $\mathcal{P}^\succ$ do not occur. □

D Implementation Details

One might wonder why we went to such lengths to prove a slightly stronger version of Theorem 19; the difference in $\overline{\pi}(FR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))$ and $FR_T(\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{P}),\overline{\pi}(\mathcal{R}))$ is not so great, and we even lose out by considering linearity before filtering rather than after (although we could get around this issue without large problems).

The main reason for this is implementation: it is significantly easier to encode, for a given rule $\ell \to f(r_1,\ldots,r_n)$, that it is usable if $f(TCap(r_1),\ldots,TCap(r_n))$ unifies with the left-hand side of a usable rule, than it is to encode that $\overline{\pi}(f(TCap(r_1),\ldots,TCap(r_n)))$ unifies with the filtered left-hand side of a usable rule: at the time of encoding, the filtering is not yet known. For formative rules, the issue is analogous.

D.1 Implementing Formative Rules FR_T

When both formative rules with respect to an argument filtering and usable rules with respect to an argument filtering are used in the reduction pair processor on a DP problem $(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\mathsf{m})$, AProVE orients the following rules from $\mathcal{R}$ with $\gtrsim$:

$$(FR_T(\mathcal{P},\, UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon,\pi)\ \cap\ UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))\ \cup\ \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$$

The reason for this particular choice is that it allowed to reuse significant parts of AProVE's implementation for the constraint encodings of usable rules with respect to an argument filtering [2]. As in [2], the generated constraints are then solved by means of SAT or SMT solvers.

To see that

$$(FR_T(\mathcal{P},\, UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon,\pi)\ \cap\ UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi))\ \cup\ \mathcal{C}_\epsilon$$

is a superset of the rules from $\mathcal{R}\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$ that need to be oriented by $\gtrsim$ in Theorem 75 (and hence that this choice leads to a sound DP processor), it suffices to consider the following the points.

1. We have:

   $$FR_T(\mathcal{P},\, UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R})\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon,\pi) \supseteq FR_T(\mathcal{P},\, UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon,\pi)$$

   because $UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R}) \supseteq UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)$ and by monotonicity of $FR_T(\mathcal{P},U,\pi)$ with respect to the set of rules U, i.e.:

   $$U \subseteq U' \quad\Rightarrow\quad FR_T(\mathcal{P},U,\pi) \subseteq FR_T(\mathcal{P},U',\pi)$$

2. Moreover, we have:

   $$UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon \supseteq FR_T(\mathcal{P},\, UR_T(\mathcal{P},\mathcal{R},\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon,\pi)\cup\mathcal{C}_\epsilon$$

   because $FR_T(\mathcal{P},U,\pi)\subseteq U$.

D.2 Implementing Split-Formative Rules SR_T

For split-formative rules, AProVE directly follows Theorem 53, where we consider only the usable rules with respect to the trivial argument filtering. Conveniently (for automation, not for power), they can be computed in advance.